+

1

EUREKA, CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 17, 2000 - 9:00 A.M. 2 * * * * * 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Good morning and 4 welcome to the October 17 meeting of the California 5 Integrated Waste Management Board. 6 Would the secretary please call the roll. 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton. 8 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Here. 9 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones. 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Here. 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina. BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Here. 12 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian. 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Here. 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti. 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Here. BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson. 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here. 18 We have a quorum. I would like to welcome all 19 20 the members of the audience, and at this time I'd like to 21 ask you please to turn off any cell phones or pagers so as not to not disrupt our meeting. Thank you very much. 23 We will start with Senator Roberti on ex partes. 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I do. I received from 25 Mr. Donald L. Wolfe, County of Los Angeles, a

- 1 communication regarding Los Angeles County Countywide
- 2 Integrated Waste Management Plan and Summary Plan and
- 3 Siting Element. I have received from Mr. Joseph Massey,
- 4 Coalition of Independent Recyclers, a communication
- 5 regarding implementation of container recycling and
- 6 litter abatement act and potential expansion of the role
- 7 of the California Integrated Waste Management Board.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 9 Mr. Medina.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Mine have been filed
- 11 already.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- Mr. Paparian.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yes. Yesterday we met
- 15 with Kim Stempy of the Redding City Materials Recovery
- 16 Facility, just general issues affecting the City of
- 17 Redding. Probably should report the Arcata Food Co-Op
- 18 yesterday since they are on our agenda today. And then
- 19 finally I had an E-mail from Mandy Rhoades of San Benito
- 20 County regarding Item 20 and general diversion and other
- 21 issues.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: All filed.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I am also up to date.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- I would also like to report we took a tour of
- 5 the North Coast Co-Op and met with a number of people
- 6 yesterday.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And me on that one.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes. Senator Roberti
- 9 also.
- 10 I just received a fax from the Partnership for
- 11 Environmental Progress. It's signed by Doug Perkins,
- 12 Executive Director, asking for consideration of used oil
- 13 non-profit grant awards, Agenda Item 23. He was asking
- 14 for our consideration, just received that.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Madam Chair, since we're
- 16 making site reports, on October the 3rd I did make a site
- 17 visit to the Stockton Cogeneration Plant.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. We'll go
- 19 ahead, now that we've had all our ex partes, and Senator
- 20 Roberti, did you wish to make any reports?
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I just returned from
- 22 speaking to a conference in Rome on solutions to waste
- $23\,\,$ problems for the new millenium and to tell you that some
- 24 problems are universal, besides other things. I want to
- 25 say I did go to a MRF in the city of Peruja, and it's

- 1 very interesting.
- 2 They -- their slogan is 35 percent by 2003. So
- 3 we're ahead of them, but on the other hand they want to
- 4 make up for lost time and they actually all through the
- 5 part of Italy I was in they had eight recycling cans.
- 6 They recycle separately down to medical materials,
- 7 batteries, various kinds of metals. It seems to be
- 8 popularly received, although one person said her husband
- 9 said, "If I've go to do all the work, they should lower
- 10 my taxes." So they're trying to catch up and it was
- 11 very, very interesting and some problems are universal.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- Mr. Medina, are you done with your report?
- 14 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I am.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Yes. I had a number of
- 17 things happen in the last month. I also visited the
- 18 Stockton Cogeneration facility, the B & J Landfill
- 19 outside of Dixon.
- 20 I attended a meeting of the Desert Managers'
- 21 Group in San Diego. These are the state and federal
- 22 officials who address common concerns in the desert.
- 23 Among their concerns, of course, are problems associated
- 24 with illegal waste disposal in the desert. Along with
- 25 several staff people, I attended the Industrial Ecology

- 1 2000 Conference in Berkeley a couple weeks ago.
- 2 And on October 10th we held a meeting on
- 3 electronic wastes. This is one of my particular
- 4 interests. Board Member Medina attended along with a
- 5 number of representatives of Board staff, Cal/EPA,
- 6 Department of Toxic Substances Control, USEPA, and we're
- 7 planning to follow up to address some of the concerns
- 8 associated with electronic waste issues.
- 9 There's also a meeting coming up of the -- being
- 10 coordinated by the Materials for the Future Foundation on
- 11 November 8th having to do with infrastructure for
- 12 computer recycling.
- 13 And the last thing I wanted to report on is the
- 14 AB 75 plans, just so it's not a surprise to everybody, I
- 15 am asking that a few of them be pulled for review at the
- 16 November board meeting pretty much as a representative
- 17 sample of the types of state facilities that fall under
- 18 AB 75 so we can get a sense of what these plans are like
- 19 and what the typical types of facilities are going to do
- 20 to comply with AB 75.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 22 Mr. Paparian.
- Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Thanks, Madam Chair. Just
- 25 a couple of things.

- 1 I think if you remember at the last meeting we
- 2 had some real concerns about some of the numbers coming
- 3 out of these new base years. I told Board Members we
- 4 were meeting that next day. We had that meeting. I
- 5 think there's still some concern about the numbers, but
- 6 we've got a better idea of some of those issues and where
- 7 some of the numbers were coming from.
- 8 I think probably during the next couple of weeks
- 9 we ought to have a discussion about possibly when we do
- 10 the new diversion study maybe we have a workshop prior to
- 11 that and let some of these professionals come in and have
- 12 a workshop and let's talk about how we get to these
- 13 numbers so we all feel comfortable about it.
- 14 The other thing is I couldn't make the all-staff
- 15 meeting, but I did dictate a little discussion to
- 16 Jeannine to deliver, have Karen Fish deliver at that
- 17 all-staff thanking everybody, Mr. Eaton and Rick Dunn and
- 18 Mr. Paparian and others, especially Mark Leary and Karen
- 19 Fish and all the folks that worked on SB 876 that the
- 20 Governor signed. I just want to do it in person, thank
- 21 everybody, TJ's group, everybody's groups for working so
- 22 hard to get that bill passed. I think it's kind of
- 23 amazing that it's the poster child of a proposition.
- 24 And then I was -- the reason I couldn't be at
- 25 that all-staff, I was at Camp Roberts with Tom Estes and

- 1 Bill Orr and John Blue working with the Corps of
- 2 Engineers and the National Guard on the cleanup of Camp
- 3 Roberts. Camp Roberts was a facility that's been turned
- 4 over to the State of California. It has to go through
- 5 410 buildings to be deconstructed, and we've been working
- 6 on that process for quite a while because somebody had
- 7 suggested that it all go to a hazardous waste dump and it
- 8 would have made it just semi-cost prohibitive to follow
- 9 that direction.
- 10 So we've got all of the regulating agencies
- 11 working together to try to come up with a way and we
- 12 actually had a very fruitful day of giving some ideas on
- 13 ways to minimize their expenses. I bring that up because
- 14 the Governor has commissioned a council to look at base
- 15 closures in the state of California. The state of
- 16 California got hit hardest during the break and he wants
- 17 to make sure it doesn't happen again, and retired General
- 18 Kellogg is the head of that council who's been around
- 19 quite a while.
- They had 350 people at a meeting. Everybody
- 21 complained about how hard it is to be competitive from
- 22 California, and nobody from any of the Environmental
- 23 Protection Agencies were there so they've asked that we
- 24 put some fire under some people to get them involved in
- 25 this and hopefully not lose potentially \$30 billion in

- 1 payroll and services that are spent every year at bases
- 2 in California.
- 3 And finally, I'll be leaving Saturday to go back
- 4 to SWANA in Cincinnati where I'm going to participate in
- 5 one of the keynote openings for the Solid Waste
- 6 Association of North America and we're going to talk
- 7 about how people listen. So we'll see.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: You can tell us all
- 9 about that when you get back.
- 10 Mr. Eaton.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Many things, but in the
- 12 interest of time because I know we have a time
- 13 constraint, I like a couple of others did decide to pay a
- 14 visit to Sunshine Canyon and that was a very interesting.
- 15 For those of you who haven't gotten there, those Board
- 16 Members, I would suggest it would be most instructive. I
- 17 know, Madam Chair, you've been there and Senator Roberti,
- 18 but it's really worth checking to see what their plans
- 19 are for expansion.
- 20 And then not quite the varietal wines of Italy,
- 21 but I did visit the Napa Valley and Joe Pestoni's
- 22 facility in the central Napa Valley which five or six
- 23 years ago really was a -- to some in the community an
- 24 eyesore and with funds from the Board and work done by
- 25 the family is turning a lot of the vines and a lot of the

- 1 crushings into productive composting. And what they've
- 2 done with odor control and other kinds of things was very
- 3 constructive. Especially with this time of the year,
- 4 many of the growers are going to be starting crush
- 5 season, but far be it the investigative part that we're
- 6 really at the height of the crush and the orders are the
- 7 highest at this point. It was very instructive how they
- 8 took funds from our agency and really worked to try and
- 9 bring it under control and now it's one of the premiere
- 10 places in all the top wineries using the composting. It
- 11 was really a shining star amongst everything. So that
- 12 was very, very instructive and obviously we have a few of
- 13 those as they come up with odors (inaudible).
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Eaton.
- 15 Before I give my brief report, I just want to
- 16 thank all of those involved for the passage of SB 876,
- 17 and especially to Mr. Eaton and Mr. Jones who worked
- 18 tirelessly. And I know I speak for all my colleagues in
- 19 thanking you both. We wouldn't have had it without you
- 20 and Mark Leary and Rick Dunn. Mark Leary of course, TJ
- 21 and Karen and many, many more people. It was just a real
- 22 team effort. And of course we are very grateful to
- 23 Governor Davis for signing it. Anyway, thank you all
- 24 very much to all of you involved.
- 25 As far as my activities, I met with Tony

- 1 Wydebrow from the North Sidney Waste Board. He visited
- 2 and was very impressed with everything our staff was
- 3 doing. Met with LEAs from the City of San Diego and the
- 4 City of Los Angeles. Spoke at a recycling forum in
- 5 Victorville and met with the Canadian delegation. They
- 6 were in Sacramento and also learned just a great deal
- 7 from our staff and had wonderful things to say about what
- 8 we were doing here.
- 9 I visited the Miramar Landfill in San Diego, met
- 10 with Paul Ryan and an Orange County delegation on
- 11 composting issues and possibilities of discussions with
- 12 the South Coast AQMD, which will be coming forth, and I
- 13 thank Mr. Jones for bringing it to my attention. Also
- 14 visited the MRF at Folsom Prison.
- 15 And lastly, attended the Governor's Conference
- 16 for Women in Long Beach and 10,000 women attended. It
- 17 was really a great event.
- 18 And with that, as Mr. Eaton said, we do have a
- 19 long agenda today. I do want to mention for those of you
- 20 in the audience there's speaker request forms and I
- 21 believe they're at the side table. If you'll fill it out
- 22 with the specific item or items you plan on addressing as
- 23 well as the item number and give it to Ms. Villa, who is
- 24 right over here, she'll make sure that we know of your
- 25 desire to speak.

- 1 One other thing that was very interesting. I
- 2 did visit the Copperopolis Asbestos monofill and it was
- 3 very interesting.
- We are going to go slightly a bit out of order.
- 5 Senator Chesbro was going to be here to welcome us.
- 6 Well, we'll go right into that then.
- 7 Good morning, Senator Chesbro.
- 8 SENATOR CHESBRO: Good morning.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: It's just an honor and
- 10 a pleasure to welcome you this morning. We really thank
- 11 you for joining us in Eureka, and before I turn the
- 12 microphone over to you, I want to just take a minute to
- 13 tell you how much we appreciate you coming up and being
- 14 with us today.
- As a member of this Board from 1990 until 1998,
- 16 although I didn't personally get to serve with you, you
- 17 played a key role in shaping many of the integrated waste
- 18 management programs and policies that are still in effect
- 19 today. As a member of the California State Senate, your
- 20 leadership on waste management issues continues to assist
- 21 us in improving the outlook for sustainable materials
- 22 policy in the future.
- 23 And I'd like to add a personal note of thanks on
- 24 behalf of the Board for your efforts in the final hours
- 25 of the legislative session, which I understand was pretty

- 1 hectic, at getting Senate Bill 876 to the Governor's
- 2 desk. And this bill as we spoke about will reauthorize
- 3 and strengthen our waste tire program and we're deeply
- 4 grateful to you.
- 5 Thank you for being here and I'll turn it over
- 6 to you, Senator Chesbro.
- 7 SENATOR CHESBRO: You're welcome, but I want to
- 8 turn the thanks around and thank you for coming here and
- 9 meeting in my home county. By meeting here, you bring
- 10 together two of the things that I feel most passionately
- 11 about. One of them is my home, which is here on Humboldt
- 12 Bay, and to have a chance to share the beauty of this
- 13 community and with folks from elsewhere in the state,
- 14 especially those who have some authority over the fate of
- 15 my constituents and the programs that serve them.
- 16 It's really great to have you here, and I know
- 17 the people of Humboldt County really appreciate it when a
- 18 state board or agency takes the time to come up behind
- 19 the redwood curtain to visit and get to know the
- 20 community a little bit better because it really does make
- 21 a difference I think for folks to have that first-hand
- 22 knowledge. So we really appreciate you being here.
- 23 I also want to acknowledge the City of Eureka
- 24 and Mayor Flemming for making the chambers available to
- 25 you and let you know that both Arcata and Eureka were

- 1 pioneers in establishing recycling programs, especially
- 2 in rural areas a long distance away from the urban
- 3 centers where the markets are. And I happened to have
- 4 been involved in that effort back in the early '70s. I
- 5 can't claim that we were first, but it was pretty darn
- 6 close in terms of the modern recycling world.
- 7 It was kind of a college town kind of thing to
- 8 do at first, and people thought we were a little crazy to
- 9 be so excited about garbage and preaching the value of
- 10 what was in that pile of waste that most people wanted
- 11 picked up before sunrise and to disappear, which had been
- 12 the traditional view in our state and traditional role of
- 13 both the providers of the service and the regulators was
- 14 to make sure that part was done and it was done right.
- Well, we began the process in 1971 establishing
- 16 a rural community recycling center along with a couple of
- 17 dozen elsewhere in the state, again mostly in college
- 18 towns, but it spread very quickly and it was only a
- 19 matter of a year or two later that City Garbage, the
- 20 waste hauler for the City of Eureka, at their transfer
- 21 station here in Eureka recognized that there was market
- 22 share at stake and they had better provide the services
- 23 that Arcata was getting.
- 24 I know Steve is laughing because Steve remembers
- 25 all this very well, but it spread quickly in this county.

- 1 Even though -- think about the obstacles of hauling
- 2 materials to the Bay Area, basically close to 300 miles
- 3 to sell your materials or north to Portland or places
- 4 close to Portland. When we started off doing it, the
- 5 newspaper was worth so little we used to hand-load bundle
- 6 by bundle onto a semi truck and then drive down behind it
- 7 in an old VW bus down to Emeryville and hand unload all
- 8 those bundles of newspapers. That's how primitive things
- 9 were.
- 10 We've come a long, long ways, and the
- 11 partnership between local government and the waste
- 12 industry, the citizens of the state and the recyclers of
- 13 the world to help get AB 939 in place and create a new
- 14 vision for California in terms of the value of the
- 15 materials that we used to call waste but now we view as a
- 16 resource, really has been -- represents a tremendous
- 17 amount of progress. And I'm pleased that this community
- 18 played a key role in helping to build that and that I had
- 19 an opportunity to serve on the Waste Board and to help
- 20 further those issues around the state.
- 21 I take a lot of pride in the time I spent on the
- 22 Board working to build a strong, independent voice and
- 23 independent forum in state government where the balance
- 24 between those -- the diverse interest that are affected
- 25 by what you do here at the Board could be established and

- 1 could be maintained, and I want to really strongly
- 2 encourage you to continue to recognize that a board
- 3 structure has a unique opportunity to have a public forum
- 4 by which all of those different viewpoints can come and
- 5 be hashed out.
- 6 Having dealt as a local official for 17 years
- 7 with state bureaucracies that don't have a public face
- 8 the way the Waste Board does and don't have a public
- 9 forum, I can tell you that the board decision making
- 10 process offers opportunities that you never get from
- 11 other state bureaucracies. For that reason and also my
- 12 passion about the issue, you can count on me to continue
- 13 to be an advocate for your continued success, for your
- 14 continued independence, for your ability to continue that
- 15 process.
- 16 I don't think any other process of decision
- 17 making could have led to the achievement of the waste
- 18 diversion that has taken place since 1990 and the sense
- 19 of cooperation and team effort between all of the
- 20 different folks, the waste hauling industry, the public
- 21 and local governments, as well as the environmental
- 22 community that has occurred with this Board.
- 23 I'm pleased to note that Humboldt County has
- 24 achieved 75 percent diversion for the unincorporated
- 25 areas and 50 percent for the county overall, and I'm

- 1 stealing Ms. Citrino's thunder. I don't know if she's
- 2 going to be addressing you, but I'm sure that's what she
- 3 wanted to tell you, but I want to acknowledge her because
- 4 she has been a real leader in the community to help
- 5 achieve those goals.
- 6 I first met her when we were imposing or
- 7 attempting to impose rural -- charges for rural disposal
- 8 sites and she came forward and represented many of the
- 9 voices in the rural community that were unhappy about
- 10 that, but she was different because instead of just
- 11 saying I don't want to pay the fee, she was saying why
- 12 aren't you guys recycling more. And she wound up -- you
- 13 know, when you get up and you intelligently come up with
- 14 an intelligent analysis, you sometimes wind up with a
- 15 job, and that's what happened with Liz. She's been at it
- 16 ever since and she's done a really good job for the
- 17 people of Humboldt County.
- 18 I also want to take note of the accomplishments
- 19 of the Humboldt Waste Management Authority. The Joint
- 20 Powers Agency, through much effort and not little
- 21 controversy, developed a regional waste management system
- 22 that will help this rural region deal effectively with
- 23 the present wastestream and also respond to future needs.
- 24 I hope the Board and staff have the chance to develop a
- 25 better understanding of how this organization has

- 1 evolved. I think that having served on many joint powers
- 2 authorities at the local level it's a real achievement to
- 3 have an agency that's working together to solve problems,
- 4 and I want to encourage you to continue the sense of
- 5 state-local partnership that has existed in the history
- 6 of the Board and to work closely with the local
- 7 governments of Humboldt County because I think they've
- 8 worked very constructively with the State, both in the
- 9 disposal end and on the recycling waste reduction end, to
- 10 help achieve the hierarchy that the people of the state
- 11 have mandated through the legislation AB 939.
- 12 Again, welcome, and I continue to offer my hands
- 13 of assistance and partnership to you as your friend in
- 14 the State Senate to help further both the Board's role as
- 15 well as the very important hierarchy and other goals of
- 16 AB 939.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much,
- 18 Senator Chesbro. We appreciate you being here and we
- 19 appreciate being in beautiful Humboldt County. It's
- 20 gorgeous up here so it's our pleasure to be here, and as
- 21 well as in the city of Eureka. Is Mayor Flemming here at
- 22 this point?
- 23 MS. CITRINO: Well, this is Humboldt County and
- 24 so we understand that she's on her boat, on her way here.
- 25 She lives on an island which is only accessible by boat,

- 1 so if it's appropriate, then we could go ahead to Item C
- 2 and come back to her as soon as she gets here.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: That would be great.
- 4 Item C is the Humboldt Waste Management Authority
- 5 presentation, Gerald Kindsfather.
- 6 MR. KINDSFATHER: Good morning to you all.
- 7 We're truly honored that you would come to Humboldt
- 8 County and visit us here. We did hope that the sunshine
- 9 would follow you from Sacramento, but it didn't happen to
- 10 do that.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yesterday was beautiful.
- 12 MR. KINDSFATHER: And tomorrow there are some
- 13 tours and I hope tomorrow will be as beautiful as it was
- 14 yesterday. Perhaps is a good day to get the fog out of
- 15 the way.
- 16 The solid waste system in Humboldt County is in
- 17 a transition period and we're nearing the end of that in
- 18 that the expansion of our new facility is under
- 19 construction and we have a tour of that scheduled for you
- 20 tomorrow. We're very anxious for that to be completed
- 21 and for to us move into that facility because it does
- 22 provide us additional waste reduction activities.
- 23 We did extensive design research as we were in
- 24 the paper phase of this project. We visited numerous
- 25 transformation facilities and recycling facilities, and

- 1 we talked to administrators, we talked to truck drivers,
- 2 we talked to traffic directors, we talked to the laborers
- 3 who maintained the recycling bins, and it was amazing how
- 4 many good suggestions we got from people on all ends of
- 5 the staffing level. We would go up to them and say what
- 6 do you like about your facility, what would you design
- 7 differently if you could do it again.
- 8 So we took all this information over the paper
- 9 stage of this facility and did as much work on the
- 10 details as we could hoping that we would design this
- 11 facility right the first time. We're anxious for it to
- 12 be completed because we want to see how this all plays in
- 13 the reality of operation.
- 14 We're also anxious for this facility to finish
- 15 construction because we are operating in the facility
- 16 while it's under construction. We've squeezed down into
- 17 about a third of the normal operating space and it's like
- 18 living in a home when it's being remodeled. So we're
- 19 very anxious for that to be completed.
- 20 Through our operations contractor, Waste
- 21 Solutions Group, we worked with an architect to design
- 22 the facility. The facility is visible from a major
- 23 throughfare, so we were anxious for it to be quite
- 24 attractive. And in addition to working with an
- 25 architect, we did a Request for Proposals for an art

- 1 commission for the facility. We got a number of
- 2 excellent proposals. Humboldt County has a very high
- 3 concentration of nationally known artists. We did choose
- 4 one and it is an art fence, a decorative fence and gates
- 5 that will go across the facility, and it will all be made
- 6 out of found objects which the artist has been gleaning
- 7 from the wastestream since the beginning of this summer.
- 8 I did a tour of her studio last week to get an update on
- 9 progress and she's marvelously creative so we're very
- 10 anxious for that aspect of it to be completed.
- There is a tour scheduled, as I said, tomorrow
- 12 at I believe 9:00, and so we invite you folks to come
- 13 down to the facility, see it in its transition phase.
- 14 We'll show you the plans, show you the facility as it's
- 15 under construction and hope that you will return and see
- 16 the facility when it is completed, when the art fence is
- 17 completed, and see it in operation. At this time what I
- 18 would like to do is introduce Liz Citrino, and Liz
- 19 doesn't need much of an introduction, we all know her
- 20 quite well, and Maurine Hart, and also I would like to
- 21 publicly thank Liz for all the work she did in making
- 22 this a reality.
- Thank you.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Good
- 25 morning.

- 1 MS. CITRINO: Welcome, Madam Chair and Members
- 2 of the Board. The last time that this Board met in
- 3 Eureka, I was pretty much brand-new in my job. I think
- 4 it was July of '92. So we're delighted to have you back
- 5 at a time when we feel that we have made immense progress
- 6 in terms of implementing the plan that was written in
- 7 response to the state law, as well as the tour tomorrow
- 8 of the transfer station in progress. We hope that there
- 9 will be time to show you the existing transfer station
- 10 that this Board was involved with through a very
- 11 difficult permitting process a couple of years ago.
- 12 More than that, we are very proud of the
- 13 activities that local businesses have undertaken as our
- 14 partners in achieving the goals of AB 939, and we brought
- 15 with us today just a few of the products that are
- 16 manufactured locally that help to divert materials from
- 17 the wastestream. Included in those are a soil amendment
- 18 product made by Fox Farm and Maurine has a few samples
- 19 over there and we want to move quickly because we know
- 20 you have a lot of work to do. Take it away, Vanna.
- 21 (Laughter)
- 22 MS. HART: That could be a facility tour
- 23 tomorrow.
- 24 MS. CITRINO: That potentially -- it's right by
- 25 the Arcata Transfer Station, so we may be able to squeeze

- 1 that in. We know you're all looking forward to seeing
- 2 Fire and Light Originals and the facility that they use
- 3 to produce recycled glass products. These are some of
- 4 the dishware that they sell internationally that have
- 5 been used for awards and many other things. In addition,
- 6 they now have added a line of decorative hearts which we
- 7 understand are 97 percent recycled content.
- 8 We're very proud of the work that they've done
- 9 and many other local companies. There's a local business
- 10 that takes gypsum, takes sheet rock and grinds it into
- 11 being used as a soil amendment at one of the local bulb
- 12 farms. There is a company which has been involved in
- 13 training workers to help us with deconstruction in recent
- 14 years. They're reclaiming valuable redwood and returning
- 15 it to useful second life in the community.
- 16 Those are just really few of the highlights and
- 17 I think to me what that says is we're all partners in the
- 18 effort to reduce waste here. I think that to us
- 19 achieving the AB 939 goals is not simply a matter of
- 20 collecting bottles and cans and has not been just that
- 21 for a very long time.
- We see waste reduction, waste prevention, source
- 23 reduction and recycling and compost as part of a frame of
- 24 mind and a change in behavior, and the efforts that we've
- 25 made locally have been to work with the public, to work

- 1 with the businesses, to make them our partners in
- 2 changing our habits and changing our lives for the
- 3 future.
- 4 Again, welcome and thank you.
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much,
- 6 Liz. I see that Mayor Flemming has arrived and we're
- 7 really happy that you would come over on your boat to
- 8 welcome us. Won't you come forward.
- 9 I had the pleasure of serving with Mayor
- 10 Flemming four years on the California Coastal Commission
- 11 and she has welcomed us to Eureka several times and it's
- 12 always been a real pleasure. Thank you so much for
- 13 taking time to be here.
- 14 MAYOR FLEMMING: Absolutely. And I apologize
- 15 for being late and yes, I did come screaming across in my
- 16 skiff. Forgive me.
- 17 I just mostly wanted to once again truly welcome
- 18 you here. You will discover that your whole goal and
- 19 mission is an absolute culture here and that is
- 20 completely embraced by the entire region as your tour
- 21 yesterday I think probably enlightened you somewhat.
- 22 We're so very proud of all the efforts made by our
- 23 citizens. We have an amazing commitment from our
- 24 citizens and it benefits the entire state, I think.
- We once again truly welcome you and hope you

- 1 enjoy your visit here, and I hope you get to get out and
- 2 about a little. I know you did yesterday and there's so
- 3 much to see, and we're so proud of the region that I hope
- 4 you do have some time. I know you're going to be working
- 5 hard, but take that time and enjoy it. Thank you for
- 6 being here.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much,
- 8 Mayor Flemming. We appreciate it.
- 9 MAYOR FLEMMING: And I'll be in the office next
- 10 door.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Thank you.
- 12 We're now moving on to -- let's see. We are
- 13 going to change our agenda just a little bit because I
- 14 know Senator Chesbro would like to be involved in a
- 15 couple of these items, but we will go ahead and have the
- 16 report from Regional Council of Rural Counties, Larry
- 17 Sweetser and Jim Hemminger. Won't you come forward,
- 18 please.
- 19 MR. HEMMINGER: Hi. Thank you very much. My
- 20 name is Jim Hemminger, Program Director for the
- 21 Environmental Services Joint Powers Authority. We
- 22 represent 21 member counties, rural counties throughout
- 23 this state, and I would also like to thank the Waste
- 24 Board for inviting us to make a presentation today. Very
- 25 honored to be here.

- 1 It was suggested the best way we could show our
- 2 appreciation was to observe our 15-minute time allotment.
- 3 I had suggested it was more of a goal than a mandate, but
- 4 I was told otherwise my good faith efforts wouldn't
- 5 count. So we'll try to be brief.
- 6 (Laughter)
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 8 MR. HEMMINGER: Yes. And we're fortunate today
- 9 to have four representatives from four of our member
- 10 counties with us, and each one of them was going to get
- 11 up and say a few words also.
- 12 As the Board knows, the rural counties comprise
- 13 a big land area of California and a small amount of the
- 14 waste. We have about a third of the land area of
- 15 California occupied by the member counties of the ESJPA,
- 16 and together all the rural counties of the state make up
- 17 about 4 to 5 percent of the waste stream. That presents
- 18 some particular challenges, but we're not here today to
- 19 bemoan the difficulties that are facing the rural
- 20 counties. We're rather here to look at the challenges we
- 21 face and give some examples of the extent which rural
- 22 counties have been able to comply with the statutes and
- 23 with AB 939, as well as all sorts of other regulatory
- 24 issues involving landfills.
- 25 As a whole we're quite proud of what we've been

- 1 able to achieve in the last ten years. When AB 939 first
- 2 passed, although some rural counties, Humboldt, Tuolumne
- 3 to a large extent and others embraced the goals of AB
- 4 939, other rural counties, some of the smaller counties
- 5 were a little slower in coming around. I think those
- 6 days are behind us, and to a large extent as rural
- 7 counties no longer the problem child of California, we're
- 8 making great progress and extremely proud of what
- 9 different member counties have been able to achieve.
- Mark, who is the Chairperson of our Technical
- 11 Advisory Group with ESJPA, was first going to speak, go
- 12 over some of the challenges that rural counties do face
- 13 and discuss some of the ways we're going about facing
- 14 those challenges, then other speakers were going to talk
- 15 about the accomplishments member counties have been able
- 16 to make in different areas of waste management.
- 17 Before turning over the podium, we did put
- 18 together a table with some brochures, freebies, a
- 19 demonstration of some of the activities that the rural
- 20 counties are moving forward with. As we know, public
- 21 education is a key component of any program. ESJPA,
- 22 Environmental Services Joint Powers Authority, is out at
- 23 about 12 county fairs this past summer talking to folks.
- 24 A lot of the other counties sponsored their own fairs,
- 25 largely with grant money but some of local resources, and

- 1 if you have a chance to pick up some of the literature
- 2 and things, it's pretty impressive, I think, what some of
- 3 the counties have to offer.
- 4 So if it please the Chair, I was going to turn
- 5 the mike over to Mark.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 7 Good morning.
- 8 MR. RAPPAPORT: Good morning. Thank you, Madam
- 9 Chair, Members of the Board. It's a pleasure and a
- 10 privilege to be here today, particularly up in this area
- 11 with our counterparts in the city of Eureka and Arcata
- 12 definitely on the cutting edge. We've been looking
- 13 towards them for many years and watching what they're
- 14 doing.
- 15 So we're talking today -- my privilege today is
- 16 to talk about the challenges faced by rural counties.
- 17 Many of these I'm sure will not be new to you, but we
- 18 look at a diverse population, a dispersed population I
- 19 should say which affects the efficiencies. Large
- 20 distances between homes affect the cost of collection of
- 21 solid waste. We are faced with large land areas which
- 22 are prone to illegal disposal, which is becoming more and
- 23 more prevalent, and we appreciate the efforts that the
- 24 Waste Board is embracing to help us cope with the illegal
- 25 disposal problem.

- We lack a large population base which obviously
- 2 affects economies of scale and our funding for our
- 3 programs, and we obviously have limited staff and
- 4 financial resources with which to work.
- 5 It was mentioned earlier today the distance to
- 6 recycling markets is a challenge once again for our
- 7 outlying rural areas, and of course we have a varied
- 8 constituent base which lends us to seek creative
- 9 solutions to educate the public.
- In spite of all of these challenges, rural
- 11 jurisdictions have responded with successful programs and
- 12 have looked to regionalization such as the Del Norte
- 13 Humboldt project that will be discussed later today,
- 14 household hazardous waste programs and regionalization of
- 15 the Certified Unified Program Agency, CUPA program.
- 16 Our 21 member counties make up eight regional
- 17 agencies and nine RMDZs, Recycling Market Development
- 18 Zones. In the 21 member counties are actually six
- 19 Recycling Market Development Zones.
- 20 Rural counties appreciate the Waste Board's
- 21 embracing flexibility and streamlining of procedures and
- 22 the continued grant programs. We look forward to working
- 23 with the Waste Board to continue to meet the challenges
- 24 and forge new programs and partnerships in the ESJPA
- 25 built on the strength of its combined membership.

- 1 And I would like to thank the Waste Board
- 2 particularly on a personal note in Tuolumne County for
- 3 the CalMAX program. We recently had a successful match.
- 4 We were able to divert more than 130 tons of waste that
- 5 would have otherwise gone to disposal in the form of some
- 6 modular office complex buildings. They were all reused
- 7 and so far it saved us about \$35,000 in demo and disposal
- 8 costs and will come off the bottom line for our AB 939
- 9 diversion. So I want to thank the Waste Board for the
- 10 CalMAX program in that regard on a personal note from
- 11 Tuolumne. By the way, I didn't introduce myself. I'm
- 12 sorry. I'm Mark Rappaport, the Solid Waste Technician
- 13 for the County of Tuolumne and the Chair of the Technical
- 14 Advisory from the ESJPA.
- 15 I thank you for the opportunity to talk to you
- 16 today.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 18 Mr. Rappaport.
- 19 MS. BARR: Good morning. I'm Jennifer Barr with
- 20 Calaveras County Department of Public Works, Solid Waste
- 21 Division. I am the Program Manager there and I wanted to
- 22 talk a little bit about how our counties are complying
- 23 with AB 939. On average, our member counties, 21 member
- 24 counties, have achieved 40 percent diversion rate. Four
- 25 of those counties, Alpine, Lassen, Mono and Trinity, have

- 1 exceeded the 50 percent goal.
- 2 One of the things that's difficult, that last
- 3 10, 5 percent, whatever our counties are trying to reach
- 4 right now, the difficulties and challenges Mr. Rappaport
- 5 explained earlier do make it difficult. We are making
- 6 good faith efforts.
- 7 I know in Calaveras County some of the things
- 8 we've done recently is expand our curbside recycling
- 9 program so it is now available to all of our county
- 10 residents. We've also implemented fee incentives to help
- 11 encourage the source separation of certain materials at
- 12 our landfill, and we are also in the process of building
- 13 a waste recovery transfer center which will allow our
- 14 landfill staff to do more separation at the site.
- 15 However, that last percent as far as the year
- 16 2000 is concerned probably won't make it to 50 percent.
- 17 So we are very happy that the definition for rural was
- 18 included in the revisions to the rural reduction.
- 19 One thing I would also like to note is with the
- 20 five-year review process coming up, we would like to ask
- 21 the Board to remain flexible and we'd like to continue to
- 22 concentrate on our programs and not have to divert staff
- 23 resources from our programs -- excuse me. I'm nervous.
- 24 We don't want to divert our staff from our programs in
- 25 order to have to redo all of our SRREs and whatnot. So

- 1 we're hoping that this will be a good process and will
- 2 work out well.
- 3 Thank you.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Ms. Barr.
- 5 Good morning.
- 6 MR. SWEETSER: Getting there. I'm Larry
- 7 Sweetser. I've been adopted as the consultant to the
- 8 JPA, and I'm going to address a couple issues on the
- 9 permitting and compliance issues.
- There are some problems out there. There's many
- 11 misconceptions, but overall I've been impressed with the
- 12 efforts I've seen on the counties out there, as well as
- 13 the successes I've seen. The permitting issue,
- 14 streamlining has been a blessing out there. For example,
- 15 as many of the counties are closing their landfills and
- 16 switching over to transfer stations and recycling centers
- 17 and the ability to go to a notification tier instead of a
- 18 full-blown permit for a couple of debris boxes out in the
- 19 woods has really been helpful in the sense that we can
- 20 divert that money into programs, also into the landfill
- 21 closure issues. Now if you could only actually help us
- 22 with some of the Water Board permits, that would be more
- 23 streamlining.
- On the compliance issues, many of the counties
- 25 have small facilities. They have the same problems as

- 1 the large ones. In fact, it's probably harder to run a
- 2 small site than it is to run a large site. But with the
- 3 efforts I've seen out there, many of them have reduced
- 4 the amount of issues they've had, the number of problems.
- 5 There's fewer landfill gas issues, fewer facilities
- 6 showing up on the list of noncompliant facilities and a
- 7 lot less of the old disco permits.
- 8 On closure, many of the counties are going
- 9 through closure on some of the old sites. Keep in mind a
- 10 lot of these are still filling on the old footprints from
- 11 1993, unlined sites and other things, so that enhances
- 12 some of the closure issues going on. For example,
- 13 Calaveras, Inyo, Siskiyou, Trinity, Tuolumne, all have
- 14 gone through landfill closures or are going through those
- 15 now. In fact, some of them are on your facility loan
- 16 compliance list. They will be seeking funding to help
- 17 them through for that process. In fact, Trinity is on
- 18 there.
- 19 Inyo County is another one. I just spent time
- 20 down there on the tire grant process with them, amnesty
- 21 day last weekend, and for a county that's 10,000 square
- 22 miles, it's 1.48 people per mile. They've actually got
- 23 three active landfills, two of which -- two landfills are
- 24 going closure now for transfer stations, and they've got
- 25 programs out there for metal, cardboard, phone books,

- 1 paper. You name it, they've pretty much done it out
- 2 there. Household programs, oil programs. They're all
- 3 working on those programs and they're at 41 percent
- 4 diversion in a county like that, and it's all done with a
- 5 half a cent sales tax. So they are working out there and
- 6 you'll be seeing a lot of efforts as things come forward
- 7 on the others.
- 8 I'll turn it over to Tom Starling from Mariposa.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 10 Mr. Sweetser.
- 11 MR. STARLING: Good morning. I'm Tom Starling
- 12 from Mariposa County. Mariposa County is the home of
- 13 Yosemite National Park. There are 16,000 people that
- 14 live in the county with over 4 million tourists each
- 15 year, which created problems for us from our organics
- 16 standpoint. We've looked for an innovative solution to
- 17 those problems.
- 18 So approximately five years ago we formed an
- 19 alliance with Yosemite National Park and the State of
- 20 California which was represented by Waste Board staff and
- 21 the County. It was determined at that time for us
- 22 because of what we felt were a high percentage of
- $23\,$ organics in our wastestream that we should look at MSW
- 24 composting, which is something that has really not taken
- 25 place here in the state of California.

- In order to determine whether that would be the
- 2 case or not, it's been a long, drawn-out process. We did
- 3 do a new waste characterization study this year and found
- 4 that yes indeed, we have more organics than what we
- 5 thought we did. In order to help with the funding
- 6 because the project would be approximately \$5 million, we
- 7 went to Congressman Ordanovich for federal funding. In
- 8 the budget for the Department of Interior, the County got
- 9 \$1,800,000.
- We received tremendous public support from the
- 11 community. Board of Supervisors support has pretty much
- 12 been unanimous and we're looking for decision on the
- 13 project by the end of this calendar year and hopefully
- 14 construction in mid-2001.
- Thank you.
- 16 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 17 Mr. Starling.
- 18 MR. DE ROCO: Good morning. I'm Jerry DeRoco,
- 19 Glenn County Solid Waste Manager. I want to finish this
- 20 up on as bright a note as we can.
- 21 We're doing in the ESJPA a number of regional
- 22 programs, not only within our county regional agencies
- 23 but between all the counties, and we're currently
- 24 operating a regional household hazardous waste collection
- 25 operation out of a facility grant fund that we had placed

- 1 in Glenn County and we're serving Butte, Glenn, Lassen,
- 2 Plumas, Tehamas, Siskiyou, Trinity and Nevada Counties
- 3 out of that. We're collecting waste and bringing it
- 4 there. These programs have enabled us to build
- 5 foundations, relationships, credibility and stature in
- 6 all of our counties, and it's been tremendously well
- 7 received. We're doing HHW collection events, tire
- 8 amnesty days, ABOPs, free dump days including appliances
- 9 and we're also using DOCDR funds for CRV collection and
- 10 litter collection.
- I spend about 30 to 60 hours a week on recycling
- 12 and solid waste programs and I'm proud to say my county
- 13 supports things I have not charged one dime to a grant
- 14 for my time. You've all probably received an invitation
- 15 to the running track dedication we're going to do with
- 16 one of the grant programs. We resurfaced a running track
- 17 at the Butte Glenn County College District, beautiful
- 18 track. It looks like an Olympic stadium track currently.
- 19 You're all invited. It's October 28th. If you would
- 20 come, we'll have VIP seating, barbecue, free tickets and
- 21 receive a shirt which is similar to this, which is paid
- 22 for by county funds, not grant funds.
- We're in hopes in our county, and I think all
- 24 counties, in fact everyone in this room should hope that
- 25 AB 876 succeeds and that Proposition 37 doesn't overturn

- 1 it.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much.
- 4 MR. HEMMINGER: Thank you. I think we actually
- 5 didn't quite meet the goal, but I would like to say a few
- 6 closing remarks. One, we do hope you walk away today to
- 7 understand rural counties are working hard. We do have
- 8 challenges, but since AB 939 has passed, I don't think we
- 9 can be sufficiently appreciative to the efforts of the
- 10 Waste Board, and particularly Waste Board staff who have
- 11 worked with us. It may be only a few percentage points
- 12 of the garbage loading, but we've certainly gotten our
- 13 share of attention from the Waste Board staff and I think
- 14 that's one of the reasons that we have been as successful
- 15 as we have. So thank you.
- 16 I did forget one thing in my opening remarks,
- 17 probably the most important. Laveda Erickson, Supervisor
- 18 from Siskiyou County, who is the chairperson of our
- 19 ESJPA, because of a scheduling conflict she couldn't be
- 20 here but she did want to express her appreciation on
- 21 behalf of the organization to the Waste Board.
- Thank you.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much
- 24 for all your hard work and a very informative report.
- 25 Moving along, I did want to mention that our

- 1 acting Executive Director, Ms. Fish, I believe you said
- 2 that you won't be giving a report today because of the
- 3 length of the meeting. I didn't want anyone to think I
- 4 forgot her, as I sometimes do.
- 5 As far as Item 5, continued business agenda
- 6 items, the following three items are continued to
- 7 November: Number 1, consideration of approval of the
- 8 diversion study guide and copies of the letter sent out
- 9 from the Board regarding this item are on the side table;
- 10 Number 2, consideration of base year change for the City
- 11 of Sierra Madre, Los Angeles County; 3, consideration of
- 12 base year change for the City of La Verne, Los Angeles
- 13 County.
- 14 It's my intention to quickly do the consent
- 15 calendar and then we're going to move to Item 4, our WRAP
- 16 awards, and then we will take out of order Item Number
- 17 15.
- 18 Moving on to the consent agenda, Items Number 7,
- 19 25 and 26 have been placed on this consent calendar.
- 20 Would any Board Members wish to pull any of these items?
- 21 Hearing none, would someone please make a motion for the
- 22 consent calendar.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I'll move we adopt the
- 24 consent calendar consisting of Items 7, 24 and 25, I
- 25 believe. Items 7, 25 and 26.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 2 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. We have a
- 3 motion by Mr. Eaton, seconded by Mr. Jones.
- Would the secretary please call the roll.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 9 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 16 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 17 I'd like to mention that Items 5 and 6 have
- 18 been pulled by request of our acting Executive Director,
- 19 and Item 19 I believe was pulled by request of the
- 20 operator. Is that correct, Ms. Fish?
- 21 MS. FISH: Yes.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: That takes us to our
- 23 first new business item which is Number 4, Waste
- 24 Prevention and Market Development, consideration of
- 25 approval of the designation of the Waste Reduction Awards

- 1 Program, the WRAP awards winners for the year 2000.
- 2 Ms. Wohl.
- 3 MS. WOHL: Good morning, Madam Chair, Board
- 4 Members. Patti Wohl, Waste Prevention and Market
- 5 Development Division.
- 6 I have the honor of introducing the first item,
- 7 consideration of approval of designation of the Waste
- 8 Reduction Awards Program, WRAP of the year winners for
- 9 2000.
- Jeff Hunts will present the item.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 12 MR. HUNTS: Good morning, Madam Chair, Board
- 13 Members. My name is Jeff Hunts. I'm a supervisor within
- 14 the Waste Prevention and Market Development Division.
- 15 This item is before the Board seeking approval of the
- 16 proposed year 2000 WRAP of the year winners.
- 17 The Waste Reduction Award Program is an annual
- 18 program established in 1992 by the Board to recognize the
- 19 voluntary efforts of California businesses to reduce
- 20 solid waste, something they're not mandated to do. It
- 21 recognizes those businesses that have made exemplary
- 22 efforts in the areas of prevention, recycling, buying
- 23 recycled, and education. And since 1993, the first year
- 24 that the awards were actually presented, the Board has
- 25 presented over 4,200 WRAP awards.

- 1 The WRAP of the year award was established in
- 2 1996 as an annual recognition of the ten -- of ten of the
- 3 most outstanding examples of WRAP winners. A panel of
- 4 evaluators from several Board divisions, this year it was
- 5 the Waste Prevention and Market Development Division, the
- 6 Office of Public Affairs and the Diversion, Planning and
- 7 Local Assistance Division, as well as participation by
- 8 Board Member office staff. This panel reviews the list
- 9 of WRAP of the year candidates and chooses ten of the
- 10 most outstanding examples for recognition.
- The ten WRAP of the year winners receive a
- 12 framed certificate from the Board, as well as a special
- 13 WRAP of the year award. Last year it was a Fire and
- 14 Light design plate engraved, and we anticipate doing this
- 15 again. As well, the winners receive statewide press
- 16 promotion.
- 17 This year's proposed winners are, in
- 18 alphabetical order -- Albertsons, Incorporated.
- 19 Albertsons is the second largest food retail and drug
- 20 store chain in the United States. It currently operates
- 21 approximately 480 retail outlets and grocery stores and
- 22 280 Sav-On Drug stores in the state of California.
- 23 Albertsons waste reduction programs include new ideas
- 24 such as ice-free broccoli packaging in recyclable boxes,
- 25 alternative to polystyrene fresh fish packaging, waste

- 1 oil reuse, recycling plastic grocery bags, and pallet
- 2 wrap tomatrex (phonetic), lumber -- that's plastic
- 3 lumber -- and donating damaged food and scraps to food
- 4 banks, churches and animal shelters.
- 5 Second candidate is Allergen, Incorporated.
- 6 Allergen is a global provider of specialty therapeutic
- 7 products headquartered in Irvine, California. Allergen
- 8 participates in a number of recycling efforts ranging
- 9 from paper and plastic recycling to ink toner cartridge
- 10 refurbishment and computer, printer and copier repair.
- 11 Allergen also recycles materials from its research lab
- 12 and donates excess chemicals and used research equipment
- 13 to local colleges and high schools.
- 14 Next is Apple Computer, Incorporated in Elk
- 15 Grove. Apple's manufacturing facility has employee
- 16 volunteers who champion recycling efforts for the site.
- 17 Apple recycles paper, glass, cardboard, wood pallets,
- 18 polystyrene and purchases recycled-content products. The
- 19 Elk Grove facility has recycled 11.9 million pounds of
- 20 waste and achieved a 91 percent recycling rate in 1999.
- 21 The next is Bentley Mills, Incorporated, the
- 22 City of Industry. Bentley Mills is a division of
- 23 Interface Carpet, a commercial carpet manufacturer.
- 24 Bentley developed a new product called Streetly Road,
- 25 which is a carpet made from 100 percent recycled nylon

- 1 fiber, and from 1994 to 1999 trash going to the landfills
- 2 from Bentley was reduced by 82 percent with an
- 3 accompanying cost reduction of 72 percent and income from
- 4 selling recyclables exceeding \$800,000.
- 5 The next is Direct Relief International of Santa
- 6 Barbara. Direct Relief is a 52-year-old non-profit
- 7 humanitarian organization which sends surplus medical
- 8 products and equipment to people in need throughout the
- 9 world.
- 10 Next is I.M. David Furniture. I.M. David of
- 11 Gardena is a wood furniture manufacturing company that
- 12 sells -- that increased their recycling rate from less
- 13 than 20 percent to nearly 100 percent. They found
- 14 diversion alternatives for their fine sawdust and small
- 15 wood scraps. They donate fabric scrap to charity and
- 16 employees and wood scrap to chess piece craftsmen.
- 17 Next is a local favorite, North Coast
- 18 Cooperative. North Coast presently incorporates a waste
- 19 reduction program which diverts more than 50 percent of
- 20 the waste produced at both their Arcata and Eureka
- 21 stores. The program includes recycling white paper,
- 22 newspaper, mixed papers, cardboard, plastic, cans, glass
- 23 and compostable materials. The co-op is also an avid
- 24 supporter of local recycling centers and efforts and true
- 25 donations at the cash register and bag rebates. The

- 1 co-op has been able to award over \$25,000 to local
- 2 recycling efforts.
- 3 The next is also a co-op. Ocean Beach People's
- 4 Organic Foods Market in San Diego is a customer-owned
- 5 California cooperative and retail vegetarian food store.
- 6 Their most successful waste reduction activity is their
- 7 off-site composting of food waste generated from their
- 8 deli and produce departments which is sent to the Co-Op
- 9 sponsored organic farm in Jamal, where they also educate
- 10 sixth graders on farming and composting practices.
- 11 The next is the Westin San Francisco Airport in
- 12 Millbrae. The Westin donates excess food to food banks,
- 13 recycles papers, glass, aluminum, plastics, uses recycled
- 14 content products, and provides environmental education to
- 15 their employees. The Westin is a member of the Recycled
- 16 Paper Coalition, which the Board is as well, and also
- 17 remember the Sustainable San Mateo County Business
- 18 Council.
- 19 And finally, Yosemite Concession Services
- 20 Corporation located in Yosemite. Yosemite Concession
- 21 Services is under contract with the national park to
- 22 operate facilities in the park that include warehousing,
- 23 transportation and food and beverage concessions.
- 24 Yosemite Concessions' waste diversion programs includes
- 25 using bicycles to save on gas and vehicle usage,

- 1 educational environmental programs, recycling workshops
- 2 and tours, donating of reusable items to charities,
- 3 on-site mulching of green waste, and green purchasing
- 4 practices.
- 5 That's the ten, and barring no questions, staff
- 6 recommends that the Board does accept the selections of
- 7 the WRAP of the year evaluation panel and approve the
- 8 list of the proposed year 2000 WRAP of the year award
- 9 winners and adopt Board Resolution Number 2000-422.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Do we have
- 11 questions?
- 12 I'm sure it was very difficult from all the
- 13 winners you had to select these WRAP of the year awards.
- MR. HUNTS: We had nearly 1900.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We're really, really
- 16 grateful for all they're doing.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I would like to move
- 20 adoption of Resolution 2000-422, consideration of
- 21 approval of designation of the Waste Reduction Award
- 22 Programs winners of the year for the year 2000.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 25 Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Paparian, to approve

- 1 Resolution 2000-422 for the WRAP of the year award
- 2 winners.
- 3 SENATOR CHESBRO: Madam Chair.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Would you like to
- 5 speak, Senator Chesbro?
- 6 SENATOR CHESBRO: Madam Chair, first of all I
- 7 want to make a comment, general comment, on the WRAP
- 8 awards, and secondly, a comment on a proposed recipient
- 9 pending your motion here.
- 10 The WRAP awards really represent a very, very
- 11 important piece of the balancing process, the uniqueness
- 12 of what this Board does. First of all, it is the carrot
- 13 side. There's a regulatory side for those local
- 14 jurisdictions and operators that aren't complying, but
- 15 there's the incentive side which the Board has pioneered,
- 16 and I think it's a very, very important tool for
- 17 rewarding the kinds of change that AB 939 envisioned.
- 18 The other Board part of it is that it puts an
- 19 emphasis on rewarding private sector behavior. One of
- 20 the gaps in AB 939 was that it put most of the regulatory
- 21 burden as far as diversion on local governments without
- 22 really as much in the way of regulatory encouragement to
- 23 businesses to help local governments achieve their goals.
- 24 Therefore, the positive incentive is that much more
- 25 important in assisting local governments by encouraging

- 1 the business community to step up and take positive
- 2 steps.
- 3 So it is one of your most important tools. I
- 4 hope that you'll continue to publicize it, to make it as
- 5 big a deal as you possibly can because there's lots and
- 6 lots of great business people in this state who are doing
- 7 wonderful things to help local governments and the State
- 8 achieve its goals.
- 9 Specifically, there's another Humboldt County
- 10 institution started I believe the same year as the Arcata
- 11 Recycling Center, and that's the North Coast Cooperative.
- 12 And the Mayor made reference to how waste reduction and
- 13 recycling is part of the culture of this county, and one
- 14 of the major contributions to making that the case,
- 15 making that happen, has been the North Coast Cooperative.
- 16 That through their pioneering many techniques, some of
- 17 which are now taken for granted in grocery stores all
- 18 over the state like giving people rebates for bringing
- 19 back bags or using reusable bags, for example. They were
- 20 doing that back in the early '70s long before it became a
- 21 common practice, and there's many, many other examples of
- 22 how before the hierarchy existed as an official policy of
- 23 the state of California, in fact almost 20 years before
- 24 the hierarchy this business was taking those steps and
- 25 has continued to really be a leader.

- 1 So it's a long overdue recognition again to the
- 2 contribution of the people of the state in building up
- 3 the momentum for AB 939 and reducing the wastestream in
- 4 California to have the North Coast Cooperative to be
- 5 recognized. So I'm very supportive and I congratulate
- 6 the Board and the staff in noticing the contribution that
- 7 the North Coast Cooperative has made.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Senator
- 9 Chesbro, and I might add that those of us who visited
- 10 yesterday were very impressed and really thank you for
- 11 giving us that wonderful tour. Secretary, hearing no
- 12 other comments would you please call the roll.
- 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 19 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 21 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 23 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Madam Chair.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Senator Roberti.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Just very briefly. We
- 3 gave a WRAP award, not WRAP of the year award, but a WRAP
- 4 award to the organization that handles the Los Angeles
- 5 Convention Center's trash pick-up. They did an
- 6 outstanding job. The young woman who runs that operation
- 7 came to me last week, the WRAP awards sort of (inaudible)
- 8 my mind on this, saying that for those institutions that
- 9 have -- are sort of event-oriented with large amounts of
- 10 trash that come in in a very short period of time, most
- 11 seminars and programs aren't geared towards that.
- 12 Their problems are unique and they're touched
- 13 upon, but they're not dealt with on a specific basis and
- 14 it really strikes me as a category that maybe ought to be
- 15 categorized in our operations. So I would hope that at
- 16 some point that she could come speak to the Members,
- 17 either in a meeting or individually, just to share her
- 18 ideas on how she feels.
- 19 This kind of trash collection can be
- 20 specifically dealt with. She has a lot of very, very
- 21 good ideas and thinks in terms of a whole new arm of
- 22 recycling rather than having it lost in their kinds of
- 23 methodologies.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: That would be great.
- 25 And I'm sure I speak for all of us, we'd love to hear

- 1 that. I know we had a great opportunity with the
- 2 Democratic convention.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Right. She was extremely
- 4 successful. I visited her just about two weeks ago. I
- 5 forgot to mention that. And their operation was a quick
- 6 successful, no problem, recycled tens of thousands of
- 7 pounds of material.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. And since
- 9 we have members from the North Coast Cooperative here
- 10 with us this morning and since the action has been taken,
- 11 I'd like to ask Senator Chesbro to join me in presenting
- 12 this award.
- 13 Thank you so much and we appreciate all your
- 14 efforts. Thank you.
- 15 (Applause)
- 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just wanted to say a
- 17 few words. The first is just thank you to Senator
- 18 Chesbro. One of my very first recollections of meeting
- 19 him was when he was advocating breaking out the recycling
- 20 center so it could solely focus on that very important
- 21 task, and the second thing is even though we've lost his
- 22 talents to Sacramento, there's a considerable spiritual
- 23 residue and we intend to cherish and recycle that 365
- 24 days a year.
- 25 And I also want to say that an award like this

- 1 really comes from a huge number of partnerships and I'd
- 2 like to just give you one brief example. The local
- 3 College of the Redwoods Community College had a toxic
- 4 waste problem. In trying to solve that, they then
- 5 consulted with Yolo River Disposal, a local garbage
- 6 company, and as part of that they got into waste
- 7 reduction and then they got into education of students,
- 8 and that is taking all the aluminum cans and recycling
- 9 them.
- They then went from there to trying to set up a
- 11 scholarship fund to reward those students, and we were --
- 12 had the opportunity to then come in and just match
- 13 whatever those funds are to really go all the way from
- 14 toxic removal to waste reduction, to an educational
- 15 program, to rewarding the students there. And so there's
- 16 a lot of different partnerships like that.
- 17 I would like to thank my Board Chair, Rodney
- 18 Grunlinger who gives me enough rope to succeed and Tonya
- 19 Stock, our marketing director. So thank you very much.
- 20 We're very, very honored. It was a complete surprise and
- 21 we will cherish this award for the rest of our lives.
- Thank you.
- 23 (Applause)
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much
- 25 and congratulations. As I mentioned, we'll be moving to

- 1 Item 15, Ms. Wohl, consideration of approval of Recycling
- 2 Market Development Revolving Loan Program application for
- 3 Fire and Light Originals.
- 4 MS. WOHL: For this fiscal year, 2001, the
- 5 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program is
- 6 budgeted to fund \$10 million in new loans. The Board
- 7 previously approved eight loans totaling \$4,154,175 that
- 8 will fund in this fiscal year. Today the Board will
- 9 consider three loans totaling \$2,364,925. If these loans
- 10 are approved and funded, then there remains \$3,480,900
- 11 available for new loan applications.
- 12 Agenda Item 15, consideration of approval of
- 13 the Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program
- 14 application for Fire and Light Originals LP. Barbara Van
- 15 Gee will present.
- 16 MS. VAN GEE: Good morning. I'm Barbara Van Gee
- 17 with the RMDZ Loan Program. This agenda item presents
- 18 for approval of Fire and Light Originals LP application
- 19 to the Recycling Market Development Zone Revolving Loan
- 20 Program.
- 21 Fire and Light is requesting \$850,000 to
- 22 purchase real estate, provide capital improvements,
- 23 purchase equipment and to fund working capital. The
- 24 project is located in Arcata, California, which is in the
- 25 Humboldt County Recycling Market Development Zone.

- 1 If this loan is approved today, they will
- 2 increase the amount of glass being diverted from the
- 3 California landfills from the current 110 tons to over
- 4 450 tons annually. This loan was approved unanimously by
- 5 the Loan Committee with no conditions or changes.
- 6 Staff recommends that the Board approve the loan
- 7 contained in Resolution Number 2000-434 to Fire and Light
- 8 Originals LP.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much.
- 10 Senator Chesbro, did you wish to speak on this item?
- 11 SENATOR CHESBRO: Sure. I'll be very
- 12 brief.
- 13 First of all, thank you for juggling your agenda
- 14 so I could be here for these items, but there's no better
- 15 example of why the Recycling Market Development Zones
- 16 were created than this wonderful business. And you've
- 17 seen the product. I hope you have a chance to see the
- 18 business.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We are tomorrow.
- 20 SENATOR CHESBRO: It was created specifically to
- 21 create markets, then of course the reality that you also
- 22 have to have a marketable product and be successful on
- 23 the business front dawn. So there was a coming together
- 24 of the recycling advocates and I think some really great
- 25 creative talent and some successful business minds and it

- 1 has blossomed into a nationally recognized,
- 2 internationally recognized success, not just for its
- 3 recycled content but also for the creativity and
- 4 wonderful nature of the product.
- 5 It's one that I think you can all feel very good
- 6 about supporting, and of course I feel very good about it
- 7 because it's in my home community here. So thank you.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Senator
- 9 Chesbro.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I have a couple of
- 11 comments, one that does not relate to Fire and Light
- 12 because obviously we know of the project but more in
- 13 generic terms and really commentary.
- 14 I would appreciate on loans a little more
- 15 information about what the loan is going for. Real
- 16 estate purchases doesn't tell me anything. Is it fee
- 17 simple, is it a leasehold interest? Is it a building?
- 18 We went through this discussion before. I can't remember
- 19 what our recollection was, but we did put a cap, if I'm
- 20 not mistaken, on the amount of money, that kind of thing.
- 21 It would be very helpful as we get into some of these
- 22 loan areas what kind of equipment are we purchasing.
- MS. WOHL: Sure.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER EATON: This obviously is not
- 25 directed to Fire and Light since it has a lot of

- 1 familiarity to most of us, but I do believe it's very
- 2 important given the fact that we've had some defaults and
- 3 there could be more defaults and we would like to know in
- 4 addition to the Loan Committee that we at least know what
- 5 those are. Are these purchases of land plus structure?
- 6 MS. VAN GEE: In this case yes, it is land and a
- 7 building.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And how large a parcel?
- 9 MS. VAN GEE: The parcel is -- it is five and a
- 10 half acres and a 12,800 square foot building. And
- 11 they're also buying -- I believe it's a furnace, a new
- 12 furnace as well as the real estate.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Maybe if we can get that
- 14 information in terms of some of the other loans we have.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think we would all
- 16 agree we would like that.
- Mr. Jones.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair, I'll move
- 19 adoption of Resolution 2000-434, consideration of
- 20 approval of the Recycling Market Development Revolving
- 21 Loan Program application for Fire and Light Originals.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I'll second the motion.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 24 Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Eaton, to approve Resolution
- 25 2000-434.

- Madam Secretary, would you please call the roll.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 14 Motion approved. We'll go back to our regular
- 15 order and Item 5 and Item 6 were pulled by the Executive
- 16 staff. Item 7 we approved on consent. That takes us to
- 17 Item 8.
- 18 MS. WOHL: Agenda Item 8, consideration of
- 19 approval of Central Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority as
- 20 contractor for the Bay Area Landscape Management
- 21 Contract, Concept Number 26. Judy Friedman will present.
- 22 MS. FRIEDMAN: Good morning, Madam Chair and
- 23 Board Members. For the record I'm Judy Friedman, Manager
- 24 of the Organics and Resource Efficiency Branch.
- 25 This item requests Board approval of Central

- 1 Contra Costa Solid Waste Management Authority as
- 2 contractor for the Bay Area Landscape Management Outreach
- 3 Partnership. In October of 1999, the Board approved
- 4 Contract Concept 26 for \$290,000 to implement local
- 5 government partnerships to conduct landscape maintenance
- 6 outreach programs in the year 2000. The purpose of these
- 7 programs is to promote environmental beneficial on-site
- 8 landscape management and organics procurement practices
- 9 to the professional landscape maintenance industry.
- Today's item specifically provides \$72,000 in
- 11 partial funding to the Central Contra Costa Solid Waste
- 12 Authority to be contract manager and fiscal agent for
- 13 partnership of local jurisdictions in the San Francisco
- 14 Bay Area. This partnership will promote and implement
- 15 the objectives of the landscape management in six Bay
- 16 Area jurisdictions of Alameda, Contra Costa, Napa, San
- 17 Benito, Santa Clara and Solano.
- 18 In addition, this item requests the Board to
- 19 redirect \$14,000 from the funds previously set aside in
- 20 the contract concept for production, printing, display
- 21 and distribution of educational and informational
- 22 materials to support this outreach program.
- 23 Please note that to meet the program's matching
- 24 fund requirement, the proposed contractor has received
- 25 pledges of funds or cash value in-kind services totaling

- 1 \$381,000 from local jurisdiction partners in the six Bay
- 2 Area counties that are supporting this partnership.
- 3 Combined with the Board's proposed allocation, the
- 4 partnership currently has a minimum of \$453,000 in
- 5 resources pledged to conduct this program, so it's a very
- 6 well-participated, very exciting partnership.
- 7 Staff recommends the Board approve option one
- 8 and adopt Resolution Number 2000-421 for this agenda
- 9 item.
- 10 Are there any questions?
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Any
- 12 questions? Hearing none, Mr. Paparian.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'll move Resolution
- 14 2000-421, approval of Central Contra Costa Solid Waste
- 15 Authority as contractor for the Bay Area Landscape
- 16 Management Outreach Partnership.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. We have a
- 19 motion by Mr. Paparian, seconded by Mr. Jones, to approve
- 20 Resolution 2000-421.
- 21 Please call the roll.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.

- BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 9 Number 9. Motion approved.
- 10 MS. WOHL: Agenda Item Number 9, consideration
- 11 of approval of contractor for the California Legal
- 12 Profession Paper Waste Reduction Project, Contract Number
- 13 IWM-C9072, fiscal year 1999-2000 Contract Concept Number
- 14 36.
- Jeff Hunts will present.
- 16 MR. HUNTS: Good morning again. This item
- 17 requests that the Board consider and approve a contractor
- 18 for the California Legal Profession Paper Waste Reduction
- 19 Project.
- 20 At their -- at your April 2000 meeting, the
- 21 Board approved the scope of work for this project and
- 22 also approved the redirection of \$30,000 from funding
- $23\,$ originally allocated for AB $75\,$ grants. The augmentation
- 24 increased the amount of funding for this project to
- 25 \$50,000.

- 1 In early 1998, Board staff had identified the
- 2 legal profession as one of California's business sectors
- 3 representing the greatest potential for waste paper
- 4 reduction and began investigating ways to provide
- 5 technical assistance to this sector. In July of '98,
- 6 Board staff formed a partnership with the Environmental
- 7 Law Section of the State Bar of California to pursue an
- 8 educational project to help the California legal
- 9 profession reduce its use and disposal of paper.
- 10 In February of '99 the Foundation for the State
- 11 Bar awarded the ELS, the Environmental Law Section, a
- 12 \$5,000 grant to conduct with significant assistance from
- 13 Board staff a paper waste reduction education project for
- 14 California's legal profession.
- 15 And while Board staff was able to achieve I
- 16 think quite a bit of that project, it also became clear
- 17 that we lacked the expertise and experience, with the
- 18 legal profession in particular, to perform all of that
- 19 project's tasks. This led staff to propose a contract to
- 20 secure external specialized assistance for an expanded
- 21 project.
- 22 In June of this year the Board released an RFP
- 23 for this project, the Legal Profession Paper Waste
- 24 Reduction Project. A proposal submitted by Gary Liss and
- 25 Associates contained a qualifying bid of \$48,984. It met

- 1 all of the minimum qualifications and, therefore, the
- 2 Board's Contract Unit posted a notice of intent to award
- 3 the contract on August 17th of the year 2000.
- 4 Barring any questions, staff's recommendation is
- 5 that the Board approve the award of the contract for
- 6 \$48,984 to Gary Liss and Associates to perform the work
- 7 specified in the scope of work for Contract IWM-C9072,
- 8 commencing immediately upon approval of that contract.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Hunts.
- 10 I see no questions.
- 11 Mr. Jones.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair, I'll move
- 13 adoption of Resolution 2000-423.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Moved by Mr. Jones,
- 16 seconded by Mr. Paparian, to approve Resolution 2000-423
- 17 and we'll substitute the previous roll call.
- 18 Item 10. Thank you.
- 19 MS. WOHL: Agenda Item 10, consideration of
- 20 approval of reuse assistance grant awards, fiscal year
- 21 1999-2000, Contract Concept Number 56.
- 22 Sara Weimer will present this item and Item
- 23 Number 11.
- 24 MS. WEIMER: Good morning, Madam Chair and
- 25 Members of the Board. My name is Sara Weimer. I'm with

- 1 the Waste Prevention and Market Development Division.
- 2 Agenda Item 10 is for consideration of approval
- 3 of reuse assistance grants, fiscal year 1999-2000,
- 4 Contract Concept Number 56. This agenda item is for
- 5 approval of staff's funding recommendations for the reuse
- 6 assistance grants, cycle one.
- 7 At the October 26-27th, 1999 meeting, the Board
- 8 adopted Contract Concept 56, reuse assistance grants for
- 9 \$150,000. At the June 20th and 21st, 2000 meeting, the
- 10 Board adopted the scoring criteria and the process for
- 11 evaluating the cycle one grant applications. The NOFA
- 12 was mailed on July 3rd, 2000 to over 1,000 interested
- 13 parties, as well as made available on our web site.
- 14 Staff received a total of four grant applications.
- 15 The first application was from the City of
- 16 Redding. Their project was to promote and expand its
- 17 current reuse program; to expand its reuse-recycle
- 18 drop-off area by 6,825 square feet; to accept materials
- 19 which are currently being sent to landfills; and lastly
- 20 for promotion through ads, fact sheets, and a coloring
- 21 contest.
- 22 The second applicant, San Joaquin County, was to
- 23 develop an educational outreach program to encourage
- 24 businesses and residents to reuse materials; secondly, to
- 25 conduct waste audits for businesses generating targeted

- 1 materials; to develop a reuse manual identifying
- 2 locations that use targeted materials; an advertising
- 3 campaign targeting the business community; and lastly,
- 4 education through community newsletters, articles and
- 5 advertising encouraging reuse.
- 6 The third applicant, Tahema County Sanitary
- 7 Landfill Agency, their proposal is to construct a
- 8 building for the purpose of expanding an existing
- 9 materials exchange program which currently deals only
- 10 with household hazard waste; to include materials beyond
- 11 household hazardous waste and provide any separating of
- 12 household items.
- 13 The last applicant for the reuse assistance
- 14 grants is Ventura County. Their proposal is to implement
- 15 a high profile multimedia campaign to promote the use of
- 16 the restore; and secondly a campaign that will include
- 17 newspaper ads, a direct mail package, information
- 18 displays at key point of purchase or permit counters;
- 19 phone book ads, a billboard, one-on-one contact with
- 20 contractors pulling building permits, and regular
- 21 reminders to the VC Max publication and web site.
- 22 All four grant applications met the minimum
- 23 storing criteria of 70 points. Staff is recommending
- 24 these proposals for funding. These four proposals total
- 25 \$123,954.50 in funding requested.

- 1 Are there any questions?
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: How many requests did we
- 3 have?
- 4 MS. WEIMER: How many applicants?
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes.
- 6 MS. WEIMER: Four.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I suspect next year in
- 8 the second year of operation we'll anticipate more.
- 9 MS. WEIMER: Definitely. Simply because this
- 10 was the first grant of the cycle, a lot of people weren't
- 11 quite aware of it and they felt that they didn't have
- 12 enough time to complete a full application and they feel
- 13 having that in mind that they will be able to apply for
- 14 the second cycle. So we do anticipate receiving a lot
- 15 more.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Madam Chair, I think this
- 17 is a very important embarkation for the Board to start
- 18 the business of stressing reuse which is at the top of
- 19 our hierarchy in addition to recycling.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 21 Mr. Medina.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Madam Chair, I'd like to
- 23 move adoption of Resolution Number 2000-424,
- 24 consideration of approval of reuse assistance grant
- 25 awards, fiscal year 1999-2000, Contract Concept Number

- 1 56(1) that includes the City of Redding, County of
- 2 Ventura, San Joaquin County, Tahema County Sanitary
- 3 Landfill.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Second.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Moved by Mr. Medina,
- 7 seconded by Mr. Jones, to approve Resolution 2000-424.
- 8 May we substitute the previous roll call?
- 9 Okay. Item 11. Thank you very much.
- MS. WEIMER: Thank you. I'm also doing Item 11.
- 11 Item 11 is consideration of approval for CalMAX
- 12 Partnership Mini-Grant Awards, fiscal year 1999-2000,
- 13 Contract Concept 56.
- 14 This agenda item is for approval of staff's
- 15 funding recommendations for the CalMAX Partnership
- 16 Mini-Grants.
- 17 At the October 26-27, 1999 meeting, the Board
- 18 adopted Contract Concept 56, CalMAX Partnership
- 19 Mini-Grants for \$100,000. At the May 23rd-24th, 2000
- 20 meeting, the Board adopted the scoring criteria and the
- 21 process for evaluating the grant applications.
- 22 The NOFA, Notice of Funding Availability, was
- 23 mailed on May 24th, 2000, to all cities and counties in
- 24 California, as well as made available on the Board's web
- 25 site, and staff received a total of eight grant

- 1 applications.
- 2 The applications we received were by the County
- 3 of San Bernardino. They requested \$5,000 for their
- 4 production and distribution of informational brochures
- 5 promoting CalMAX and full funding is recommended for
- 6 them.
- 7 The second applicant, County of San Joaquin,
- 8 they requested \$10,000 for printing, distribution and
- 9 display of brochures to promote CalMAX. Full funding is
- 10 recommended for them as well.
- 11 The County of Santa Cruz was the third
- 12 applicant. They requested \$10,000 for staff promotional
- 13 time, news ads, printing costs for newspapers and
- 14 newsletter inserts that promote CalMAX and insert fee.
- 15 Partial funding of \$5,000 was recommended as staff costs
- 16 were not eligible.
- 17 The City of El Monte requested \$9,800 for staff
- 18 time to do waste audits and promotion, printing and
- 19 distribution of newsletters on CalMAX. Partial funding
- 20 of \$3,025 was recommended as staff costs are not
- 21 eligible.
- 22 The City of Napa was another applicant. They
- 23 requested \$9,965 for staff promotional time, preparation
- 24 of a display ad about CalMAX, and placement of that ad in
- 25 local newsletters and newspapers. Partial funding of

- 1 \$2,255 was recommended as staff costs are not eligible.
- 2 The City of Ontario was another applicant. They
- 3 requested \$5,000 for truck site advertisement to promote
- 4 CalMAX, printing CalMAX informational brochures and
- 5 report covers. Partial funding of \$3,439 was recommended
- 6 as this amount of applicable matching funds were
- 7 provided. The balance of matching funds were not related
- 8 to CalMAX.
- 9 The City of Santa Fe Springs was another
- 10 applicant. They requested funding for design, printing
- 11 and mailing of brochures and flyers. Partial funding of
- 12 \$7,708 was recommended as cost for clerical items was
- 13 determined to be excessive, \$75 an hour on the grant side
- 14 versus \$18 an hour on the matching side. These costs
- 15 were reduced to the same rate used for the matching
- 16 funds.
- 17 And the last applicant was the Novato Sanitary
- 18 District, City of Novato, requested \$3,400 for printing
- 19 and mailing CalMAX promotional brochures and placing ads
- 20 in trade journals. Full funding was recommended.
- 21 All eight grant proposals met the minimum
- 22 scoring requirement of 70 points. Staff is recommending
- 23 these proposals for funding. These eight proposals total
- 24 \$39,927 in funding requested.
- 25 Are there any questions?

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: All right.
- 2 Mr. Jones.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair, I'll move
- 4 adoption of Resolution 2000-425.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 7 Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Paparian, to approve
- 8 Resolution 2000-245. Hearing no objection, we'll
- 9 substitute the previous roll call. Thank you very much.
- 10 Item 12, consideration of approval of 99-2000
- 11 sustainable building grant awards.
- 12 MS. WOHL: Agenda Item 12, consideration of
- 13 approval of fiscal year 1999-2000 sustainable building
- 14 grant awards, fiscal year 1999-2000, Contract Concept
- 15 Number 78.
- 16 Kristen McDonald will present.
- 17 MS. MC DONALD: Good morning, Madam Chair and
- 18 Board Members. My name is Kris McDonald. I work in the
- 19 Green Building Section.
- 20 This agenda item requests approval for the
- 21 funding recommendations of staff for the sustainable
- 22 building grant cycle two. Also at the October 1999 board
- 23 meeting, the Board adopted Contract Concept 78 for green
- 24 building design and construction project grants for
- 25 \$350,000.

- 1 At the May 2000 board meeting, there was a
- 2 redirection of an additional \$72,997 for recycle to the
- 3 sustainable building grants. This brings the total for
- 4 cycle two to \$422,997. Also at the May 2000 board
- 5 meeting the Board adopted the scoring criteria and the
- 6 process for evaluating the cycle two sustainable building
- 7 grants.
- 8 The Notice Of Funds Available was mailed on June
- 9 1st to over 800 interested parties and was also made
- 10 available on our web site. Staff received a total of 15
- 11 grant applications.
- 12 Would you like me to go through those and give a
- 13 brief description?
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes, very briefly.
- MS. MC DONALD: Okay. Ventura County is for
- 16 construction. Their costs are going to incorporate green
- 17 building and recycled-content materials into their
- 18 construction costs. City of Berkeley is a program grant
- 19 and that's to support the expansion and marketing of a
- 20 technical assistance hotline. City of Orinda is
- 21 construction, and those are construction costs associated
- 22 with using recycled-content materials in their newly
- 23 remodeled city hall.
- 24 The City of West Hollywood is a program grant to
- 25 identify green building practices and to develop green

- 1 building criteria and support interactive workshops.
- 2 City and County of San Francisco is a program to develop
- 3 a green building tool kit along with a series of training
- 4 workshops. And the City of Santa Monica is a program to
- 5 implement design and construction guidelines.
- 6 Six of those 15 met the minimum scoring
- 7 requirement of 80 points and we're recommending these
- 8 proposals for funding. The proposals total \$290,310.84
- 9 and staff is also seeking Board approval to come back at
- 10 a later date with green building concepts to encumber the
- 11 remaining \$132,686.16.
- 12 Barring any questions, staff recommends option
- 13 one, to approve staff's recommendations and award grants
- 14 for sustainable building and direct staff to develop
- 15 proposals that are consistent with the original
- 16 allocation and adopt Resolution Number 2000-437.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Madam Chair.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Senator Roberti.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Last meeting we discussed
- 20 the possibility of using unencumbered money. I know all
- 21 the money our staff is telling us (inaudible) encumbering
- 22 it. Nevertheless, I would hope that we look at the
- 23 possibility of this unencumbered money as it may be
- 24 getting started on the trade show in southern California
- 25 as one of the options, not to preclude anything new

- 1 coming in that might be something very, very important.
- 2 But it's hard to find a pool of money where there isn't a
- 3 large number of applicants.
- 4 So I would just like that to be considered as we
- 5 vote in the future on any other requests.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Senator
- 7 Roberti.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: I know that these funds
- 9 for the City of Berkeley are going to the technical
- 10 assistance hotline. I know that we had previously funded
- 11 them in the last two years. What did we previously fund
- 12 them for?
- 13 MS. WEIMER: We funded them for -- in cycle one
- 14 we funded the Shore Bird Environmental Visitors Center
- 15 for \$50,000, which was a construction project; and in
- 16 June of 2000, which also fell under the first cycle, we
- 17 funded the creation of a citywide green builder program,
- 18 \$45,000.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Also I would
- 21 just like to ask for consideration that the money be
- 22 looked at for the collaborative for high performing
- 23 schools, would that qualify, and then also conservation
- 24 for a charter school project. If you could just look at
- 25 those when you bring back options for us.

- 1 Okay. Any other comments?
- 2 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I'll move we adopt
- 3 Resolution 2000-437.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Eaton.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Second.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton moves,
- 7 Mr. Jones seconds, to approve Resolution 2000-437.
- 8 May we substitute the previous roll call?
- 9 MS. WEIMER: Thank you.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 11 Item 13.
- 12 MS. WOHL: 13 and 14 are the remaining two
- 13 loans. Agenda Item 13, consideration of approval of the
- 14 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program
- 15 application for Maderas LLC and Barbara Van Gee will
- 16 present this and the next item.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 18 MS. VAN GEE: I'm Barbara Van Gee, RMDZ Loan
- 19 Program.
- 20 Agenda Item 13 presents for approval the Maderas
- 21 LLC application to the Recycling Market Development Zone
- 22 Revolving Loan Program. They're requesting \$337,500 to
- 23 finance commercial real estate, which is raw land, and
- 24 machinery and equipment, which is a grinder.
- 25 The project is located in the city of Chino

- 1 which is the Chino and Chino Hills Recycling Market
- 2 Development Zone. With this project, the company will
- 3 increase diversion of green waste by 3,000 tons annually.
- 4 If you would like a breakdown of the amount,
- 5 \$215,000 of the loan is going for land and \$121,000 is
- 6 for the grinder.
- 7 Staff recommends that the Board approve the loan
- 8 contained in Resolution 2000-431 to Maderas LLC in the
- 9 amount of \$337,500.
- 10 Any questions?
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I have one question.
- MS. VAN GEE: Yes.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Are all the local
- 14 government use permits obtained?
- MS. VAN GEE: Yes, they are.
- 16 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair, I'll move
- 18 adoption of 2000-431, consideration of approval of a
- 19 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program
- 20 application for Maderas LLC.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 23 Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Medina, to approve Resolution
- 24 2000-431.
- We'll substitute the -- hearing no objection,

- 1 we'll substitute the previous roll call.
- 2 Item 14.
- 3 MS. VAN GEE: Item 14 is consideration of
- 4 approval of the Recycling Market Revolving Loan Program
- 5 application for K&R Products, Inc. This agenda item
- 6 presents for approval K&R Products, Inc.'s application in
- 7 the amount of \$1,245,000 to purchase and install
- 8 machinery and equipment and make leasehold improvements.
- 9 The project is located in Santa Cruz, which is
- 10 located in the Central Coast Recycling Market Development
- 11 Zone. With this project, they will increase diversion
- 12 from 90 to 100 tons a year. Currently the company is
- 13 using 250 tons of virgin material annually of which 100
- 14 tons is going to landfills. So with this project that
- 15 100 tons will be diverted from the landfill.
- 16 The loan was approved unanimously by the Loan
- 17 Committee and staff recommends that the Board approve the
- 18 loan contained in Resolution Number 2000-433.
- 19 Are there any questions?
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have a couple questions,
- 21 Madam Chair.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The 250 tons of virgin
- 24 resin --
- 25 MS. VAN GEE: Yes.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- is what is delivered for
- 2 them to make their product?
- 3 MS. VAN GEE: Exactly.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And they make a medical
- 5 plastic product.
- 6 MS. VAN GEE: I believe so, yes, it's a medical
- 7 product.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Can they use
- 9 recycled-content material to provide that medical
- 10 product?
- MS. VAN GEE: From what they have told us, yes,
- 12 they can. They can use that. They can regrind it and
- 13 use it back in because it's just the waste.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Is the 100 tons of
- 15 material -- my problem with this loan is it's really
- 16 being given out for source reduction and it's just a more
- 17 efficient way for this operator to go through 250 tons of
- 18 virgin material, but my question is is the new machinery
- 19 going to actually help them -- are we going to see a
- 20 hundred tons of material or is it a hundred tons of
- 21 material in source reduction because of a better
- 22 manufacturing line?
- MS. VAN GEE: No. The 100 tons, my
- 24 understanding is because of the equipment, that without
- 25 putting in this new equipment they would not be able to

- 1 do the source reduction.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right. So the hundred tons
- 3 of source reduction or the hundred tons of diversion is
- 4 source reduction because they're upgrading their virgin
- 5 line.
- 6 MS. VAN GEE: Right. And my understanding is
- 7 the old facility would not -- the way it's set up, it's
- 8 in two different buildings, that they would not be able
- 9 to modify their existing equipment to get this reduction,
- 10 this additional 100 tons, that they need to be in a new
- 11 location and have an efficient production line in place.
- 12 They've also given us some information.
- 13 Although the contract is not signed yet, they do expect
- 14 to -- it's an extremely large contract for a million
- 15 units per day which would use 13,000 additional tons of
- 16 virgin feedstock per year.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: 13,000?
- 18 MS. VAN GEE: 13,000 tons.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: They're going to go from
- 20 250 tons to 13,000 tons with this equipment?
- 21 MS. VAN GEE: Right. And of this amount 5,148
- 22 tons would be diverted. So this equipment that they're
- 23 getting in will allow them to expand the products that
- 24 they can produce and the amount that they can produce.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Somewhere I read that

- 1 this does create some new jobs.
- 2 MS. VAN GEE: Yes, it does. They are expected
- 3 to create 10 new jobs with this project.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Hearing
- 5 all questions, do we have a motion?
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I move Resolution
- 7 2000-433.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Motion by Senator
- 9 Roberti, seconded by Moulton-Patterson, to approve
- 10 Resolution 2000-433.
- 11 Secretary, please call the roll.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 14 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 16 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- MS. VAN GEE: Thank you.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Before we go ahead --
- 2 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We do need to take a
- 3 break, so go ahead.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I think there was
- 5 questions raised about what type of facility this loan is
- 6 really going for and how much material was really being
- 7 diverted for the amount of money that's being spent on
- 8 it. Somehow I'd like to see us consider the whole
- 9 process in the future to ensure that we're maximizing the
- 10 amount of diversion for the limited amount of money we
- 11 have for this program.
- 12 MS. VAN GEE: Yes, we are looking at that, at
- 13 doing that.
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 15 Mr. Paparian. And now we'll take a ten-minute break.
- 16 (Recess taken.)
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to call the
- 18 meeting back to order and it's that part of our agenda
- 19 for permits.
- 20 Mr. Walker, Item Number 16.
- 21 MR. WALKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Scott
- 22 Walker, Permitting and Enforcement Division.
- 23 Under this category today we have two
- 24 consideration of revised Solid Waste Facility Permits for
- 25 transfer processing stations. One, consideration of a

- 1 revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for a landfill. We
- 2 then had an information item on the semiannual update on
- 3 the inventory of Solid Waste Facility Permits that are
- 4 violating state minimum standards, and then finally we
- 5 will have consideration of the adoption of the proposed
- 6 regulations on the enforcement.
- With that, Mark DeBie will present the
- 8 Permitting and Enforcement items.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 10 MR. DE BIE: Thank you, Scott. Mark DeBie with
- 11 the Permitting and Inspection Branch.
- 12 Item 16 is the consideration of a revised Solid
- 13 Waste Facility Permit for the San Bruno Transfer Station
- 14 in San Mateo County.
- With this revised permit, the permitted tonnage
- 16 will increase from 120 tons per day to 250 tons per day.
- 17 There will also be an increase in hours of operation
- 18 during Monday through Friday and adding Saturday
- 19 operations.
- 20 Board staff have been able to make all of the
- 21 required findings for this revised permit and, therefore,
- 22 staff recommend that the Board adopt Solid Waste Facility
- 23 Permit Decision Number 2000-440 concurring in the
- 24 issuance of Solid Waste Facility Permit 41-AA-0014.
- 25 Representatives from the operator are present,

- 1 and if you have any questions I can answer them or the
- 2 operator can.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I think I asked this
- 5 last week, but as far as you know there are no public
- 6 concerns about the change.
- 7 MR. DE BIE: As far as we know. We have heard
- 8 no information about public concerns. This is a light
- 9 industrial area, very few residents even near the
- 10 facility.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Actually there are no
- 14 residents near this facility and these guys are usually
- 15 here at 2:00 in the morning but they couldn't dump until
- 16 5:00.
- 17 I'll move adoption of Resolution 2000-440,
- 18 consideration of a revised Solid Waste Facility Permit
- 19 for the San Bruno Transfer Station in San Mateo County.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Mr. Jones
- 22 moves, Mr. Medina seconds, to approve Resolution
- 23 2000-440.
- 24 Would the secretary please call the roll.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 12 Item 17.
- 13 MR. DE BIE: Agenda Item 17 is consideration of
- 14 a revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Universal
- 15 Refuse Removal Recycling and Transfer Facility in San
- 16 Diego County.
- 17 With this revised permit, tonnage levels will
- 18 increase from 1,000 tons per day to 2,000 tons per day
- 19 and a household hazardous waste collection facility will
- 20 be included as part of the operation.
- 21 Again, all of the findings have been made by
- 22 staff. During the briefing there were some questions
- 23 about level of noticing, and through communication with
- 24 the LEA and the operator we've been able to identify that
- 25 there was thorough CEQA noticing as well as noticing

- 1 related to amendments to the NDFE. Minimum requirements
- 2 were met in terms of 300-foot noticing around the
- 3 facility, but surrounding cities as well as some nearby
- 4 schools and the school districts were noticed and those
- 5 are beyond the 300-foot circle.
- 6 Since staff has been able to make all the
- 7 findings, we recommend that the Board adopt Solid Waste
- 8 Facility Permit Decision 2000-441 concurring in the
- 9 issuance of the Solid Waste Facility Permit 37-AA-0929.
- 10 The LEA from San Diego County is present as well
- 11 as representatives from the operator if you have any
- 12 questions.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. DeBie.
- 14 Before we take questions, I had forgotten to ask
- 15 if any members have ex parte disclosure.
- Mr. Eaton.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Nothing at this time.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: No.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Medina.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Nothing to report.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: And I have none.
- 23 Okay. Sorry.
- 24 Any questions on this item, Item 17?
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I did bring up --

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Thank you.
- 3 I did bring up in the briefing session a
- 4 question about waste going from this facility out of
- 5 state and I have had that question answered to my
- 6 satisfaction, although I do intend in the future to
- 7 explore the issue of the amount of waste that is going
- 8 out of state, not just from this facility but from any
- 9 number of jurisdictions or facilities.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 11 Mr. Paparian.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption of
- 15 Resolution 2000-441, consideration of a revised Solid
- 16 Waste Facility Permit for Universal Refuse Removal
- 17 Recycling and Transfer in San Diego County.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 20 Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Medina.
- 21 Secretary, please call the roll.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.

- BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 9 Item 18.
- MR. DE BIE: Item 18 is the consideration of a
- 11 revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Bakersfield
- 12 Metropolitan, also known as Bena Sanitary Landfill, in
- 13 Kern County.
- 14 I believe the Board Members, as well as staff,
- 15 have received a revised agenda correcting some typos on
- 16 page 2. We inadvertently indicated there was a
- 17 composting area. It should be disposal area. On page 3
- 18 we corrected the closure date on number 4 on page 3 from
- 19 2100 to 2038. Those are included in the revised agenda
- 20 and I believe that revised agenda is posted on the
- 21 Board's web site.
- 22 This permit will allow an increase of disposal
- 23 area to increase from 54 acres to 229 acres. There's
- 24 also an increase in tons per day that will be received at
- 25 the facility, increasing from 1,704 to 4,500 tons per

- 1 day. There will be an increase in the total area of the
- 2 landfill from 2,165 acres to 2,285 acres. The closure
- 3 date is being adjusted to reflect new calculations from
- 4 2057 to 2038. There's an increase in elevation of the
- 5 fill area from 1,140 to 1,520 feet, and the overall
- 6 capacity will increase from approximately 6.9 million
- 7 cubic yards to 53 million cubic yards.
- 8 Again, all of the findings have been made by
- 9 Board staff regarding this facility and this revised
- 10 permit, and so staff recommend that the Board adopt Solid
- 11 Waste Facility Permit Decision 2000-443 on the
- 12 concurrence of the issuance of Solid Waste Facility
- 13 Permit 15-AA-0237.
- 14 Nancy Ewert of the Kern County Waste Management
- 15 Department is present and would like to speak to the
- 16 Board.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 18 MS. EWERT: Good morning, Madam Chairman and
- 19 Members of the Board.
- 20 You might say that the Bena Sanitary Landfill is
- 21 the jewel of the Kern County waste disposal system. The
- 22 site actually has about 2,300 acres and is a
- 23 master-planned disposal capacity of over 440 million
- 24 cubic yards.
- 25 The Bena Sanitary Landfill began operations in

- 1 1992 as a fully lined landfill site. The original permit
- 2 covered only waste management unit one, which was 7
- 3 million cubic yards, and we are proposing a revised
- 4 permit which now covers waste management unit two with a
- 5 design capacity of 46 million cubic yards.
- 6 Some questions arose during the Board briefing
- 7 that concerned this permit and I'd like to address those
- 8 issues. They basically focused around Kern County's
- 9 import policy and also Kern County's diversion status.
- 10 The 1999 reported diversion rate is right at 50
- 11 percent. However, Kern County desires to have a healthy
- 12 and comfortable compliance margin. Therefore, the Kern
- 13 County Board of Supervisors has recently approved
- 14 mandatory collection in the metropolitan Bakersfield area
- 15 which will facilitate the expansion of curbside green
- 16 waste and composting. The County is also contracted with
- 17 the metro haulers to construct a C&D MRF.
- 18 The combination of these two programs is
- 19 expected to give Kern County a very healthy and
- 20 comfortable compliance margin with the diversion goals.
- 21 Kern County has a long-standing policy
- 22 prohibiting out-of-county waste or disposal of
- 23 out-of-county waste. There are minor exceptions to this
- 24 policy. The Board has entered into contracts with Inyo
- 25 County, San Bernardino County, and Ventura County to

- 1 service their more remote areas.
- 2 Kern County is also the home of Community
- 3 Recycling and Resource Recovery. This facility is a
- 4 regional composting facility which brings waste in from
- 5 basically the L.A. basin. Approximately 12,000 tons of
- 6 waste is disposed at Kern County landfills from this
- 7 facility, but it is tracked back to the jurisdictions
- 8 which generate the waste.
- 9 If there are any other questions regarding the
- 10 permit, I would be happy to answer them.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: The Kern County's
- 13 current disposal, your current generation, is that about
- 14 1,800 tons per day? Is that about right?
- MS. EWERT: Kern County on average disposes of
- 16 about 1,800 tons per day. The Bena Landfill right now is
- 17 permitted for just over 1,700 tons per day and we
- 18 actually on an average only receive about 800 tons a day,
- 19 but we have been known to exceed our 1,700 tons per day
- 20 when we have large construction projects or programs like
- 21 that.
- 22 Kern County right now is in the process of
- 23 consolidating down our facilities. Our Board of
- 24 Supervisors approved an infrastructure plan in 1992 which
- 25 called for reducing landfills from 15 throughout the

- 1 county down to three to four regional sites. Kern County
- 2 has reduced facilities now. We only have eight operating
- 3 landfills. In the next two years we expect to close down
- 4 two more and further convert those to transfer stations.
- 5 One of those facilities is our Arven Landfill which
- 6 accepts about another 700 to 800 tons a day. So we are
- 7 asking in our permit for 4,500 tons per day to cover the
- 8 peaks that the Bena facility could experience and also
- 9 looking at about a 15-year planning window.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: You also say the
- 11 ultimate capacity of the facility will be 440 million
- 12 cubic yards?
- 13 MS. EWERT: That's correct. That's our master
- 14 planned build-out of this facility.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: This is curiosity here.
- 16 It looks like and sounds like a big regional facility,
- 17 regional being like southern California.
- 18 MS. EWERT: It's really not, but Kern County has
- 19 been bitten in the past where we actually permitted our
- 20 facilities for our average daily tonnages and we've
- 21 received violations. So over the last several years as
- 22 we've permitted our facilities, we've permit them for
- 23 that maximum peak to also give ourselves plenty of
- 24 leeway.
- 25 As we consolidate down our facilities, the other

- 1 landfills, that waste will all be moving, especially with
- 2 the Arven Landfill, will be moving to Bena. So we need
- 3 to give ourselves a comfortable -- some comfortable room,
- 4 working space there so that we don't exceed our permit.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Right. But when you
- 6 combine the peaks with the capacity, though, and the
- 7 ultimate capacity, it still sounds big.
- 8 MS. EWERT: And it is.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: It seems like you could
- 10 take --
- MS. EWERT: And you might say --
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: -- many times the county
- 13 generation.
- 14 MS. EWERT: And I think that's the difference
- 15 just between looking at averages and peaks. Our peak
- 16 basically will allow us that latitude, but when you're
- 17 looking at Bena, I know 440 million cubic yards is a lot
- 18 of capacity and Kern County is being extremely farsighted
- 19 to make sure we have ample capacity way past 15 years.
- 20 We're looking -- Bena will give the metropolitan
- 21 Bakersfield area capacity well into the 22nd century and
- 22 that's exactly where Kern County wants to be. We sited
- 23 this large facility so we don't have to site another one
- 24 for many, many, many years.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: This gets at a broader

- 1 issue than just this facility, but I think that it will
- 2 be important for us in the future to get a handle on what
- 3 is the state in regional capacity that's out there and
- 4 planned to be out there and what does that mean in terms
- 5 of regional generation and disposal. And my
- 6 understanding is we don't have a firm handle at the Board
- 7 level yet on what that capacity and expected capacity is.
- 8 That's not a question for you, that's for my fellow Board
- 9 Members.
- 10 MS. EWERT: I understand.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I have a couple questions.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER EATON: If this is going to take
- 14 you into the 21st or 22nd century, why are you changing
- 15 the closure date to a date closer?
- MS. EWERT: The master planned site has this 440
- 17 million cubic yards of capacity but our waste management
- 18 unit two looks at 46 million cubic yards at that capacity
- 19 so the closure date is only through the end of waste
- 20 management unit two. The master planning for the site
- 21 includes a waste management unit three and a waste
- 22 management unit four and so -- but basically our crystal
- 23 ball is only so clear, so we're just permitting right now
- 24 for waste management unit two.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And so that the 46 million

- 1 is based upon today's estimates; correct?
- MS. EWERT: Today's estimates, correct.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Explain because this is the
- 4 first time I've seen a permit like this, and I don't
- 5 really have a problem except for one area. You have a
- 6 tremendous amount of horizontal expansion, correct? You
- 7 have acreage.
- 8 MS. EWERT: No. Actually our site was right
- 9 at --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER EATON: 2,100 to 2,200.
- 11 MS. EWERT: Right. And the only difference was
- 12 that -- was all within our original permitted boundary
- 13 but it was under a BLM and clouded by a mining claim and
- 14 it was BLM property. Although it was actually within our
- 15 facility boundary, it couldn't be included in our total
- 16 acreage from BLM. It was a very small piece.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So what's the total
- 18 footprint, acreage?
- 19 MS. EWERT: The whole site is just at 2,300
- 20 acres, but we have about 1,200 acres of disposal capacity
- 21 with 1,200 acres of buffer. We have purchased a buffer
- 22 all around our site.
- BOARD MEMBER EATON: I understand you've got a
- 24 lot of space for expansion. I don't understand why we're
- 25 going vertical.

- MS. EWERT: We're not going vertical.
- BOARD MEMBER EATON: It says right here increase
- 3 in maximum elevation from 1,140 to 1,520.
- 4 MS. EWERT: Well, this --
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So now you're asking to go
- 6 this way and this way, and I would like some information
- 7 from the staff as to why -- vertical is usually a last
- 8 resort. Why are we going vertical so early?
- 9 MS. EWERT: This is a new unit and we are on a
- 10 canyon fill and so the elevations across the site are
- 11 probably a thousand feet. This is a fairly -- this is
- 12 right in the foothills going up into the Tehachapi
- 13 mountains. So waste management unit two, you're correct,
- 14 is moving within our 1,200 acre disposal area but it's a
- 15 little bit higher on the site so they list the maximum
- 16 elevation as what is the maximum overall elevation from
- 17 sea level to the site. So we're picking up a little
- 18 elevation as we develop.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So the elevation that you
- 20 seek relates to the topographical.
- 21 MS. EWERT: Correct.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And we have your assurances
- 23 that it's not to add additional capacity based upon
- 24 vertical expansion.
- 25 MS. EWERT: No. Waste management unit one is

- 1 pretty much set. Waste management unit two is an
- 2 entirely new waste management unit, entirely separate
- 3 from the original waste management unit. So no, it is
- 4 not a vertical expansion of our original permit.
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Any other questions?
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I know you're not bringing
- 8 sludge in.
- 9 MS. EWERT: No, sir. We're not.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. DeBie.
- 11 MR. DE BIE: I just wanted to add two cents in
- 12 that I think Board staff appreciate the way this permit
- 13 is coming forward in a phased approach. Potentially the
- 14 operator could have asked for everything that was
- 15 reviewed in the CEQA document, which is basically their
- 16 master plan. But in bringing it in a phased approach we
- 17 can look at it in stages, and if circumstances change or
- 18 situations change, there's always an opportunity to
- 19 address the issues in the permit.
- 20 So in terms of again what Board staff appreciate
- 21 is an overall vision of where the facility is going in
- 22 the long-term but then phasing in your permit over time
- 23 so that we can have the $\operatorname{--}$ a good control over how things
- 24 progress.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Senator Roberti.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: On this landfill, it's
- 2 hard to place another requirement on a jurisdiction which
- 3 I think is what they're at 50 percent. However, there
- 4 appears to be a gaping omission and I don't know what we
- 5 should do about it except maybe develop some policies. I
- 6 don't believe any of this waste goes through a recycling
- 7 facility; is that correct? It goes to the landfill.
- 8 Maybe I am wrong, but I think that's what is the case
- 9 here.
- 10 That being the case, it seems something so
- 11 simple and something that is being ignored and so
- 12 elementary as to what we should be doing, but the
- 13 jurisdiction apparently is at 50 percent and I don't see
- 14 where we have the authority to impose anything greater on
- 15 them except that it seems to be quite apparent that
- 16 they're not doing this.
- 17 I would hope maybe we would start having some
- 18 agendas not only on the issues of regionalization, which
- 19 Mr. Paparian aptly raised, but also on the materials
- 20 going through a recycling center before they're
- 21 landfilled and I hope we could develop something along
- 22 those lines.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Any other comments?
- Mr. Jones.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just one. I understand the

- 1 desire, but I look at PRC 43021 which basically prohibits
- 2 this Board from -- this Board's regulations shall include
- 3 standards for design, operation, maintenance and ultimate
- 4 reuse of the facility, but shall not include aspects of
- 5 handling, disposal, which are solely local concerns or
- 6 are within the jurisdiction of the Air Board, Air
- 7 Pollution District or Air Quality District or the Water
- 8 Board.
- 9 I only bring that up because that was a -- I
- 10 think it's one of the policies we're going to end up
- 11 talking about when we get all our 30. This was a --
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: If it's statute, we're
- 13 bound by it. And hopefully this is a good example of
- 14 maybe hoping the Legislature will be changing the
- 15 statute. It seems to be absolutely contrary to
- 16 everything we should be doing to have this product
- 17 landfilled without going through a MRF which is so simple
- 18 to do, but we are bound by statute.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And I appreciate that.
- 20 Madam Chair.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption of
- 23 Resolution 2000-443, consideration of a revised Solid
- 24 Waste Facility Permit for the Bakersfield Metropolitan
- 25 Bena Sanitary Landfill in Kern County.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Motion by Mr. Jones.
- 2 Second?
- 3 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I'll second the motion.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: To approve Resolution
- 5 2000-443.
- 6 Please call the roll.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 9 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye. The motion
- 19 passes.
- 20 19 was pulled which moves us to 20.
- 21 MR. DE BIE: Thank you. Item 20 is the
- 22 semiannual update and publication of the inventory of the
- 23 solid waste facilities violating state minimum standards.
- 24 This is an informational item. No Board action is
- 25 required.

- Basically over the last six months we've seen
- 2 three facilities come on the inventory but we've also
- 3 seen three facilities come off. So we've maintained a
- 4 number of facilities on the list at and around 17.
- 5 In this item staff has attempted to provide the
- 6 Board with additional information as a result of our
- 7 workshop with the Board. One of the recommendations was
- 8 to include additional information on the inventory
- 9 posting, but with any start-up there's some errors and
- 10 some mistakes made.
- We depended on the LEAs to some extent for this
- 12 information and it was difficult to verify in some cases
- 13 the specifics on some of the information because of
- 14 timing issues. But I just wanted to highlight a couple
- 15 corrections to attachment 1, which is -- attachment 3.
- 16 Sorry. Which is multiple pages.
- 17 On page 1 talking about the Amador County site,
- 18 the information indicates that ACES, Inc. is the owner.
- 19 They actually lease the facility from the County. The
- 20 County retains ownership and does continue to pay into
- 21 the financial assurance mechanisms for that facility. So
- 22 we are correcting that.
- 23 And then on page 5 on the Lone Pine
- 24 informational page it indicates that -- the information
- 25 that we had from the LEA is that the operator had applied

- 1 for the facility compliance loan, and what was actually
- 2 occurring is they had sent a letter of inquiry to the
- 3 Board about applying for the loan but actually did not
- 4 submit an application to the Board on that.
- 5 I just wanted to indicate that we do have two
- 6 facilities on the inventory that have applied for a
- 7 facility compliance loan and that's Red Bluff Landfill
- 8 and Brawley Landfill.
- 9 After this item is heard, Board staff will
- 10 publish the list on the Board's web page and the next
- 11 time the update will be heard will be in six months,
- 12 around April.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: How many of these are
- 15 public? Are they all public facilities? What's the
- 16 percentage?
- MR. DE BIE: Let's see how we gave it to you.
- 18 I would have to flip through attachment 3. I didn't have
- 19 the summary. Change one to be a public. It looks like
- 20 16 out of 17 are public.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Now, you also mentioned the
- 22 fact that 10 of the 16 have enforcement orders and five
- 23 have no enforcement orders. What does that mean to us as
- 24 a Board to sit there and say that we have five facilities
- 25 that violate state minimum standards? (Inaudible). It's

- 1 a little disconcerting. Is it the LEA's problem or is it
- 2 that we as a Board haven't gone and acted on a public
- 3 agency? I just want to find out what the --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I have an addendum to
- 5 that question to get the full picture. Of the ten
- 6 enforcement orders, several have expired.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER EATON: That's what it looks like.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Not only that, but some
- 9 that have expired.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. DeBie.
- 11 MR. DE BIE: The statute relative to the
- 12 inventory requires that the LEA develop a compliance
- 13 schedule for any facility that is listed on the
- 14 inventory, but compliance schedule is not well defined in
- 15 either statute or reg. What Board staff have encouraged
- 16 LEAs to do is incorporate a schedule into an enforcement
- 17 order such as a Notice and Order or Corrective Action
- 18 Order.
- 19 And so when they have done that, we've been --
- 20 we are given copies of those orders and we can track them
- 21 and record them and track them. Whether or not these
- 22 other facilities listed here that indicate they have no
- 23 order, we're not sure whether they have a compliance
- 24 schedule or not. When we inquire on the LEA and ask them
- 25 whether or not they have an enforcement order, the answer

- 1 is no. We asked them if they're seeing compliance
- 2 towards what was agreed upon. They're saying yes.
- 3 So it may be that some LEAs are finding other
- 4 mechanisms other than orders to keep the operator
- 5 towards -- moving towards compliance, but there isn't a
- 6 requirement to put a Notice and Order. The reason why
- 7 we're giving you information about the Notice and Order
- 8 is because we have access to that information. We don't
- 9 have direct access to compliance schedule kinds of
- 10 things, which again are not defined.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: But if they violate state
- 12 minimum standards -- I'm a little confused.
- 13 MR. DE BIE: There's no requirement to issue an
- 14 order if they violate state minimum standards. It's the
- 15 LEA's option to issue an order. The enforcement regs
- 16 that are the next item coming up will delineate much more
- 17 carefully than existing regs on the obligation of the LEA
- 18 to issue orders in certain circumstances. They will also
- 19 lay out the criteria that Board staff can use or the
- 20 Board can use to verify whether or not the LEA is taking
- 21 appropriate enforcement action which would then trigger
- 22 the possibility of the Board stepping in and taking
- 23 direct enforcement action.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Do you see any kind of
- 25 nudging of the LEAs as possible?

- 1 MR. DE BIE: With the new enforcement regs
- 2 there's many more tools available, both in explanation
- 3 and sending out expectations and process for the Board
- 4 and Board staff to use to nudge LEAs.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Perhaps an evaluation.
- 6 Don't we evaluate the LEAs? And if they didn't act on
- 7 state minimum standards, that is something we would note?
- 8 MR. DE BIE: Yes. That would definitely come
- 9 out in an evaluation and would show up in a work plan for
- 10 the LEA to address.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Thanks, Madam Chair. Under
- 13 the PEP policy, would that -- some of the ones that are
- 14 not covered with a Notice and Order, would they be
- 15 covered under that policy where a schedule is put
- 16 together? Would that be right?
- 17 MR. DE BIE: The Permit Enforcement Policy, the
- 18 PEP policy?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Maybe I'm saying it the
- 20 wrong way. Whatever the -- yeah. That the LEAs devised
- 21 with this Board to give them tools to help bring these
- 22 jurisdictions into compliance. And one of them, I
- 23 thought, before it went to Notice and Order they could
- 24 work on a work plan and have some specific dates when
- 25 certain things had to be completed, and then if that

- 1 wasn't honored then it went to a Notice and Order.
- 2 MR. DE BIE: Both through policy and in
- 3 regulation there's an increasing scale of enforcement
- 4 that is recommended that the LEAs take and ultimately
- 5 leading to Notice and Orders and then enforcing those
- 6 orders. So there's many things that occur prior to the
- 7 issuance of a Notice and Order. That's in the current
- 8 enforcement policy. It could be refined in the process
- 9 that's going now to address the PEP policy which is more
- 10 specific to permits.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I may have said it the
- 12 wrong way. There's so many acronyms. You knew what I
- 13 was talking about.
- MR. DE BIE: Right.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: One question on Inyo.
- 16 We've gotten all of the facilities in Inyo County off of
- 17 this list and they've reappeared. Is it because of a
- 18 site visit a couple of months in a row where they had
- 19 litter? That concerns me because they had been working
- 20 awfully hard to get into compliance, and if they're
- 21 falling back I'd like to know because I don't like
- 22 wasting my time and I don't like wasting our staff's
- 23 time, but I felt pretty good the day we got them off this
- 24 list.
- 25 MR. DE BIE: I don't know specifics on that

- 1 case, but talking with staff I think it is a result of a
- 2 recent staff visit and it may be some slippage occurring.
- 3 We can increase our message to them to get back on the
- 4 wagon.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Would you just let us know
- 6 because I think three or four of us here voted or were
- 7 very happy the day they got off this thing and it took an
- 8 awful long time to get them into compliance. I think our
- 9 offices would appreciate that.
- 10 MR. DE BIE: Okay.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I want to go back to
- 13 something that I think I heard you say and that is it
- 14 appears that some of these facilities are under some sort
- 15 of verbal compliance understandings, not --
- 16 MR. DE BIE: It's hard to pin down things when
- 17 you talk to the LEA in terms of what the understanding,
- 18 the relationship is, what's formal, what's informal
- 19 relative to some of these sites, so I don't want to make
- 20 a broad statement to say there's nothing in existence
- 21 with these sites when a Notice and Order is not included.
- 22 That's something definitive that we can point
- 23 to, that we get information on but yes, there may be some
- 24 situations where the only requirement is that the
- 25 operator continue working towards a goal and that goal is

- 1 so defined only in verbal agreement. Again, there's a
- 2 sliding scale towards ultimate enforcement. That's an
- 3 option to the LEA.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: That's -- that makes me
- 5 real uncomfortable for these sorts of situations,
- 6 especially when they're showing up on our list of
- 7 violating minimum standards, to have that ability to get
- 8 off a list potentially on verbal understandings. It's
- 9 troubling.
- 10 If we wanted to move in the direction of
- 11 assuring that any efforts towards compliance were
- 12 chronicled in writing by the LEAs, would that take an
- 13 action by the Board, could you do it through an LEA
- 14 advisory, or would there be some other mechanism to deal
- 15 with that?
- MR. DE BIE: Since we're dealing with a word or
- 17 words in statute, we would need to probably address that
- 18 through regulation in defining what we mean by compliance
- 19 schedule. I don't think a policy would be the mechanism
- 20 to use. I think it would need a regulatory change or
- 21 statutory change to indicate not a compliance schedule or
- 22 a compliance schedule should mean Notice and Order or
- 23 something like that.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Those are the words in
- 25 statute, compliance schedule?

- 1 MR. DE BIE: Compliance schedule.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: My common sense
- 3 understanding of a schedule would be something that would
- 4 be written on a piece of paper. But I guess to our
- 5 counsel, would we need -- what would we need to clarify
- 6 what it means to be a compliance schedule?
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: I think it's always safest to have
- 8 it in the regulations so that you have a chance to hear
- 9 from the regulated stakeholders and the public as to how
- 10 you're defining a term if it's not defined in statute.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: If I were a member of
- 12 the public and I wanted to go see the compliance schedule
- 13 that's mandated by the law in some of these cases, I
- 14 wouldn't be able to do it, it sounds like, because it
- 15 wouldn't exist. It's in somebody's head.
- 16 MS. TOBIAS: I see what you're saying and I
- 17 definitely think that there's a plain meaning aspect to
- 18 that statute that I think does imply a schedule, does
- 19 imply something that has to be met, but I think that if
- 20 the statute doesn't say a written compliance order or say
- 21 it must, shall be a part of the enforcement order itself,
- 22 we could certainly look at it and come back to the Board
- 23 with a legal, if you want that, but I tend to feel that
- 24 doing things in the regulations with a definition is by
- 25 far the safest approach.

- 1 MR. DE BIE: There may be information associated
- 2 with the compliance issues at the site that would help
- 3 the public understand what's occurring. For example, the
- 4 inspection report may indicate or describe what the
- 5 violation is. It may also indicate in that inspection
- 6 report what the LEA is asking the operator to do. It may
- 7 be saying please continue working towards addressing your
- 8 litter issue by applying for the facility compliance loan
- 9 program or something to that.
- 10 So there would be a record that would indicate
- 11 the LEA's communication to the operator relative to this,
- 12 but there might not be a separate formalized compliance
- 13 schedule set out.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: The ones here that you
- 15 mentioned that were not quite clear, did you go back and
- 16 look at those inspection reports to see if that was
- 17 the --
- 18 MR. DE BIE: To the extent that they did note
- 19 the violation and the description, but staff didn't
- 20 research to the level of determining whether that was the
- 21 mechanism used by the LEA. We can do that. We can
- 22 develop more information for you to report that.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Would the Board be
- 24 comfortable with directing staff to return with an
- 25 update, say in January, with a proposed method to define

- 1 compliance schedule and educate the LEAs so that all
- 2 facilities on the list have a compliance schedule as
- 3 required?
- 4 Steve. I mean Mr. Jones.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's fine. I don't have
- 6 a problem with that, but I think that as part of that or
- 7 maybe before that one of the things that we have to look
- 8 at with these chronic violators, these are violations
- 9 that happen on monthly inspection reports when an LEA
- 10 goes into a facility and inspects. So we've got some
- 11 here for litter and for daily cover, and they could be a
- 12 result of Santa Ana winds, any kind of winds, lack of
- 13 personnel on the site, the fact that the LEA happened to
- 14 walk in at a time just prior to somebody going out.
- 15 I don't know. I don't know what facilitated
- 16 that, but I see three or two of these chronic violators
- 17 have litter and daily cover. That could be a condition
- 18 that needs to be remedied similar to what we did in Inyo
- 19 County which was the Board of Supervisors, they refused
- 20 to put the dollars into the budget to allow them to do
- 21 that, and it was enough pressure by this Board that they
- 22 did allocate those dollars and rectify a lot of those.
- 23 Also they had to put fencing around those entire
- 24 facilities, which the residents felt it was their
- 25 inalienable rights to go there 24 hours a day. So there

- 1 were some big things.
- 2 That monthly inspection report is when the
- 3 violation is noted, and I think one of the things that
- 4 we've got to -- what I would like to see is in relation
- 5 to your idea, Ms. Chairman, is to look at how these
- 6 things come forward because in fact they do come off the
- 7 inspection reports. A lot of them are long-term because
- 8 they're gas violations. Those ones that aren't means, I
- 9 think, that in two consecutive months the same violation
- 10 was noted; correct?
- 11 MR. DE BIE: Correct. And that stimulates a
- 12 notice that we intend to put them on the inventory and
- 13 that gives them an additional 90 days to correct.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: To fix the problem.
- MR. DE BIE: And if they haven't corrected 90
- 16 days after that notice, then they go on the list.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So really as part of a
- 18 discussion item it would seem to me that it would be
- 19 appropriate if we keep seeing litter and grading and site
- 20 security, that part of this presentation needs to include
- 21 what did the LEA instruct the operator to do and what has
- 22 the operator agreed to before we say -- because I worry a
- 23 little bit that if we say it's got to be a Notice and
- 24 Order for litter that there may be something -- every one
- 25 of these is a public operator except one.

- These are all owned and operated by cities and
- 2 counties. The pressure from this Board in trying to
- 3 increase this level of scrutiny I think is going to have
- 4 the same benefit -- to write a Notice and Order for a
- 5 litter violation, it may end up going away 30 days later,
- 6 it may hamstring some people, but we can have that
- 7 discussion to see.
- 8 Notice and Orders do take a little while to go
- 9 through, but I'd like to see these just a little more
- 10 delineated as far as what were the sense of the violation
- 11 and what is the remedy that's being put in place, and in
- 12 a lot of cases the County won't act on these things and
- 13 the LEAs continue to write them up hoping that this Board
- 14 will be the lightning rod to force a jurisdiction to
- 15 spend the money to do that because staff is frustrated
- 16 that they can't ever get part of that allocation.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Would you come back
- 18 say in January?
- 19 MR. DE BIE: Okay. If I could seek
- 20 clarification. In expectation in January to provide
- 21 additional information about the facilities that were
- 22 listed today during this meeting or --
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think just define
- 24 compliance schedule and, as Mr. Jones said, why these
- 25 were listed.

- MR. DE BIE: Two things then.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Would these be coming
- 3 back to us as a discussion item or a consideration item?
- 4 My point is I seem to understand if it comes back as a
- 5 discussion item and we want to take action, we can't do
- 6 anything. If it comes back as a consideration item, it's
- 7 serious enough that we would want to take action.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Would January, if we
- 9 notice and everything, give enough time? If it could
- 10 come back as a discussion with the possibility of taking
- 11 action? Ms. Tobias?
- 12 MS. TOBIAS: Can I clarify? When something is
- 13 noticed as a discussion item, what that means -- it's a
- 14 key word, if you will, to the public meaning that the
- 15 Board will only be discussing that item and not taking
- 16 any action at that time. If the item is noticed as a
- 17 consideration item, the Board does not have to take
- 18 action but that merely tells the public that the Board
- 19 may be taking action on that.
- 20 But that's the way we've noticed the agenda is
- 21 to give the public that kind of notice that either
- 22 something is just going to be discussed or there's a
- 23 possibility of the Board acting.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think maybe we would
- 25 want the leeway that we could take action, but the

- 1 stakeholders would have a chance to give us their
- 2 comments.
- 3 MS. TOBIAS: I think that's --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Take action on a new policy
- 5 or on what?
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: On the definition.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: On the definition. It
- 8 appears we need to change the definition, which we could
- 9 do so.
- 10 MS. TOBIAS: What it may require is that the
- 11 Board go into a rulemaking on that and I think that's
- 12 what we don't know as staff at this time is whether we
- 13 would be coming back to you recommending that you could
- 14 do it by simply a Board policy or by legal interpretation
- 15 that says that a compliance schedule does include
- 16 something that's set out or whether we'd be recommending
- 17 a rulemaking to clarify the definition of that.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Well, I'm just
- 19 speaking for myself. I certainly want to have the
- 20 discussion and at some point be able to if we saw a need
- 21 to change it. However the Board -- whatever the Board's
- 22 pleasure is on that.
- 23 MS. TOBIAS: So you could -- what the Board
- 24 could do in January is give direction once you've
- 25 received the information. The direction at that meeting

- 1 could be either to initiate a rulemaking to change that
- 2 definition or that the Board from here on out, if this
- 3 does not amount to the need for a regulation --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: If we do that, we have to
- 5 notice it as a consideration item.
- 6 MS. TOBIAS: Yes.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: So we'd notice it as
- 8 that but we don't -- we're not under any obligation.
- 9 MS. TOBIAS: Correct. So that certainly allows
- 10 the possibility for the Board to say come back next
- 11 month, we still want to discuss this further, whether you
- 12 would like to see it move into a rulemaking. The issue
- 13 of consideration only gives the Board the opportunity to
- 14 make a decision and let the stakeholders and regulated
- 15 entities know that the Board is considering taking an
- 16 action.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: You got cut off in the
- 18 middle of a thought, but I think I'm understanding you
- 19 that you will come back with options if options are
- 20 available for something short of rulemaking but
- 21 formalizes something.
- 22 MS. TOBIAS: Right. And if there are --
- 23 whatever opportunities there are, we'll give the Board
- 24 that full spectrum if they can basically say from here on
- 25 out this is how we read this, or whether it amounts to a

- 1 rulemaking and it is something, as you know, that the
- 2 Board cannot have what are called underground
- 3 regulations, which are essentially policies which look
- 4 like regulations and walk like regulations, talk like
- 5 regulations but are, in fact, not duly adopted by the
- 6 Board. That process gives the public the opportunity to
- 7 come and talk to the Board about the regulations that
- 8 it's going to do.
- 9 So what we would be basically doing in that item
- 10 is coming back to you and saying it looks to us that this
- 11 should be a regulation or it's not or here's how we
- 12 interpret it, there's the possibility of a legal
- 13 interpretation, there are gradations that we could come
- 14 back and give you.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The question is how do we
- 16 consider long-term violators. I don't know what the
- 17 question is that's going to be considered, but I'm hoping
- 18 that that question is in the title, not some broad title
- 19 that covers the whole world, the whole universe of
- 20 statute, but a title that absolutely says what it is this
- 21 policy -- what part of this policy we're going to be
- 22 talking about.
- 23 MS. TOBIAS: Perhaps I could try to clarify with
- 24 Mr. DeBie as well. What I heard the Board focusing on
- 25 earlier was the issue of what a compliance schedule is,

- 1 the definition of that.
- Now, if you're wanting to go broader, I think it
- 3 would help staff to hear a discussion on that, but I
- 4 heard that there was some question about how a compliance
- 5 schedule works, and I think Mr. DeBie explained it a lot
- 6 of times we would be looking at the whole record there if
- 7 we were either evaluating an LEA or if a citizen walked
- 8 in they would basically say can I see the file on this
- 9 and they would look through to see what the inspection
- 10 reports said, any written documentation in there that
- 11 shows what the LEA has asked that operator to do or you
- 12 know, is it something that we need to clarify that there
- 13 should be something in writing that wraps it up and ties
- 14 a bow on it.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I think I hear the
- 16 Board saying they'd like you to come back with the
- 17 definition of the compliance schedule with giving us as
- 18 broad of options that we can have; is that right? And a
- 19 precise title. Thank you.
- 20 MS. TOBIAS: Thank you.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER EATON: If you all use your
- 22 creative thinking cap and if it doesn't fit into the box
- $23\,$ of compliance, there might be some other term where we
- 24 can get to the same point that minimizes (inaudible) but
- 25 it still promotes the policy of getting them off the

- 1 list.
- 2 MS. TOBIAS: I think that as I mentioned there's
- 3 a possibility of legal interpretation. I'm just trying
- 4 to give you the tools that staff looks at. A legal
- 5 interpretation, we have LEA advisories.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER EATON: That was mentioned.
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: Those are the different options
- 8 that I think we could come back with, and I think we
- 9 would look at it from a legal interpretation first and
- 10 see if there's anything in the statute that backs up what
- 11 this should be. From there you move into the other
- 12 choices of what the Board would like to do and all of
- 13 them have kind of varying pros and cons to them.
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Thank you,
- 15 Mr. DeBie. Anything else before you move to Item 21?
- 16 MR. DE BIE: Sure. I wanted to add one thing, a
- 17 glimmer of hope in that just the fact that we were adding
- 18 more information to this agenda item did motivate several
- 19 of the LEAs to sort of get off the mark and move the
- 20 operators a little bit closer to compliance, including
- 21 issuing a Notice and Order that had been sort of
- 22 lingering around a while. So I think just little steps
- 23 to help reach the Board's goal in getting people off
- 24 this.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much.

- We're going to take up Item 21 and then I
- 2 believe we'll take a lunch break. So if we can move to
- 3 21, Mr. DeBie.
- 4 MR. DE BIE: I'm giving 21 and then I'll be done
- 5 for the day. Thank you.
- 6 Last month the Board directed staff to notice
- 7 the enforcement regulations or regulations that are being
- 8 referred to as enforcement regs for 15-day comment period
- 9 to address changes that came out of the 45-day comment
- 10 period. So staff did notice the regulations as changed
- 11 and the 15-day comment period ended last Thursday.
- 12 Staff on Friday and Monday morning compiled the
- 13 results of the comments, and what was just handed out to
- 14 you and also is on the back table are the staff's -- is a
- 15 summary of the comments and staff's response to those
- 16 comments including suggested changes in response to those
- 17 comments. I want to draw your attention to the summary
- 18 page, which is the last page attached to the regulations.
- 19 I want to point out that the majority of the
- 20 comments during this 15-day comment period were basically
- 21 technical comments addressing typos and those sorts of
- 22 things that were inadvertently left in or did not change
- 23 after the 45-day comment period, but I did want to
- 24 highlight two comments that were received.
- 25 And the first one is under Comment Number L02-2,

- 1 which is a comment from the San Bernardino County LEA
- 2 which was in regards to inspection frequencies for
- 3 various types of facilities and various levels of
- 4 activity. Staff's response to that comment is to reject
- 5 the comment basically because we're not changing any part
- 6 of that regulation relative to that comment. It was
- 7 never an aspect of this regulation package, and the
- 8 couple examples that the commenters shared with the Board
- 9 staff in their comment are being adequately addressed
- 10 under the current regulatory structure and so we didn't
- 11 see a need to adjust or modify the language in the
- 12 proposed regulations.
- To give you a little more detail, certain kinds
- 14 of facilities, active facilities require a monthly
- 15 inspection frequency and that's a requirement in statute
- 16 and these regulations reflect that. Other facilities
- 17 that are -- or other sites that are not facilities,
- 18 therefore meaning they're not actively receiving waste,
- 19 there's some flexibility in statute and existing reg to
- 20 allow a different inspection frequency. For example,
- 21 closed sites, closed landfills, are inspected on a
- 22 quarterly basis. Certainly there's flexibility for the
- 23 LEA to increase the level of inspection, but there's a
- 24 minimum requirement of quarterly for closed sites.
- 25 Again, the existing regs in this area are not being

- 1 changed by proposed regs and the situation addressed by
- 2 the commenter is adequately addressed with the current
- 3 regulations.
- 4 The other comment I wanted to call out is
- 5 Comment L03-01, which is a comment from a staff person
- 6 with the Sacramento County LEA which brings up that issue
- 7 that was discussed after the -- or during the 45-day
- 8 comment period relative to violation and its relationship
- 9 to an enforcement action and, therefore, the connection
- 10 to a hearing panel process. So staff would like to
- 11 reject that comment based on the same rationale that we
- 12 used after the 45-day comment period, that we would
- 13 address that in an ongoing manner and not in this
- 14 regulation package.
- 15 So if the Board has any questions, I can answer
- 16 those for you, but if not, Board staff are ready to
- 17 request the Board to first adopt the Negative Declaration
- 18 for these regs and then ultimately adopt the regulations
- 19 as changed after the 15-day comment period.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: So we do the A and
- 21 then the B?
- 22 MR. DE BIE: I think you actually have to do B
- 23 and then A. For some reason it got concerted that way.
- 24 We'll need to comply with CEQA first and then the rest.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones, did you

- 1 have a question?
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I do. Your comments on
- 3 L-03-01 make me a little nervous.
- 4 MR. DE BIE: Uh-oh.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: It was my understanding in
- 6 the 45 days that you had come to a resolution of how
- 7 these appeals would be handled, that everybody signed off
- 8 on. Is that --
- 9 MR. DE BIE: The majority of the stakeholders
- 10 did sign off on that as witnessed by the testimony
- 11 presented to the Board.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- MR. DE BIE: This individual is a staff person
- 14 with Sacramento County. I don't think she represents
- 15 Sacramento County LEA. It may just be a comment from one
- 16 person.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: But my understanding was
- 18 that the -- it's not part of the reg package; right?
- 19 MR. DE BIE: Correct.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: It's just -- the
- 21 understanding is that when there is something that is
- 22 appealable, rather than appeal it you go through the
- 23 process, it gets resolved, then that's fine; if not, then
- 24 the operator still has the right to ask for the appeal.
- MR. DE BIE: Right. The agreement was by having

- 1 the regs remain silent on the relationship of a violation
- 2 relative to an enforcement action, we're also remaining
- 3 silent in the regulations relative to the appealability
- 4 of a violation. The majority of the industry feels that
- 5 they can appeal a violation. The majority of the LEAs
- 6 feel they cannot. The regs are not going to change the
- 7 status.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- that whole issue.
- 9 MR. DE BIE: Right.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: But as I -- as you were
- 11 saying that, I saw Julie shaking her head no and somebody
- 12 else shaking their head yes. I just want to know because
- 13 that goes to the heart of what these -- why these things
- 14 took so long and it also goes to the heart of what we
- 15 just spent 20 minutes talking about on the chronic
- 16 violators, that in fact it's the inspection report that
- 17 is the trigger for a chronic violator, and if it's the
- 18 trigger for a chronic violator it should also be the
- 19 trigger for an appeal. If you guys have got it worked
- 20 and we're going to stay with that, then I'm okay, but
- 21 when I start seeing shaking heads, people not sure, then
- 22 I'm not sure that I don't want to see it in
- 23 regulations.
- 24 MS. NAUMAN: Mr. Jones --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just like Kathryn says, it

- 1 only works if it's in regulation.
- MS. NAUMAN: I'm sorry you caught me shaking me
- 3 head at the inopportune time. I think we're all in
- 4 agreement. I want to reassure you that what we stated to
- 5 you last time was that there was an agreement among the
- 6 stakeholders that we will not address the issue and make
- 7 any change in regulation. I did hear Mark allude to the
- 8 fact that there was an acknowledgement that there could
- 9 be ongoing discussions about how to informally refine the
- 10 local processes so that operators would have some avenue
- 11 to engage in dialogue short of a formal appeal, but we
- 12 did not change the status quo with respect to the
- 13 regulatory language about violations or appealable
- 14 actions.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: All right. So the fact
- 16 that it's silent, if it goes through the process which
- 17 you guys have tried to work out with all the affected
- 18 parties and there is no resolution, then the operator can
- 19 make a request of this Board or of a local hearing
- 20 panel -- if they say no, then they could bring it to this
- 21 Board and we make a decision, whether or not we're going
- 22 to hear the appeal.
- MS. TOBIAS: That's correct.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: On page 21 which is the
- 2 assumption of duties of an LEA, we cannot go in and take
- 3 over unless we have an agreement with us and the local
- 4 governing board? Should that "and" have been an "or"?
- 5 Section 18351.
- 6 MS. TOBIAS: Do you have a subsection?
- 7 BOARD MEMBER EATON: A, subpart 1. It says the
- 8 Board shall assume the duties upon the occurrence of any
- 9 of the following (inaudible). So if we have a
- 10 disagreement, we need the local governing board to be in
- 11 agreement as well; correct? That's the easy one.
- 12 MR. DE BIE: That's my reading of that
- 13 requirement.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Is that a wise policy?
- 15 MR. DE BIE: The only change that these regs are
- 16 promoting is to define authorities to governing bodies.
- 17 So that's existing reg. It says local authorities and
- 18 we're defining that as governing body. That's the only
- 19 change in the proposed regs. So existing regulations
- 20 reads upon agreement of the Board and local authorities,
- 21 the designation of the Board in the manner provided by
- 22 law or.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Let me sneak one in the
- 24 back door on you then. We just had an item on chronic
- 25 violations; correct? How does this document relate to

- 1 chronic violations, and let me take you through it real
- 2 quick. We had a violation on the first page here that
- 3 says means lack of compliance with a particular standard,
- 4 permit, term or condition. And I'm trying to get at
- 5 Mr. Jones to protect the LEA here as well we may be
- 6 caught between their local governing body and the fact
- 7 that they don't do the budget.
- 8 But then on the next page you have all
- 9 facilities and proposals within the LEA's jurisdiction
- 10 shall be in compliance with state minimum standards, and
- 11 we have that. Now there's obviously 15 or 16 that are
- 12 not. And then dropping down in D, subpart one, all
- 13 operations within the LEA's jurisdictions shall be in
- 14 compliance with state minimum standards as applicable,
- 15 and yet we have nothing in here for what takes place if
- 16 the LEA doesn't. Wouldn't this have been a proper place
- 17 to put some LEA teeth in there that Senator Roberti or
- 18 others were talking about in terms of that?
- 19 In this document here -- are we missing an
- 20 opportunity with this document that we're now putting off
- 21 to January which we could have before us right now?
- 22 MR. DE BIE: Just to clarify a couple --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Is this document different
- 24 from what that would be?
- MR. DE BIE: In those citations that you

- 1 mentioned, Mr. Eaton or Board Member Eaton, reading
- 2 further on it does indicate that there's -- it does
- 3 indicate that the facility should be in compliance but it
- 4 also indicates that the LEA -- facility be under
- 5 appropriate enforcement action. And again, appropriate
- 6 enforcement action is being defined as something that
- 7 starts off with -- as described in their enforcement
- 8 program plan and may eventually escalate into a Notice
- 9 and Order. So you could have a facility that is out of
- 10 compliance but is an appropriate enforcement action.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Which subsection are you
- 12 in?
- MR. DE BIE: It would be C3 under appropriate
- 14 enforcement actions pursuant to 18084, to remedy any
- 15 violations.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mark, could you repeat
- 17 that? I'm sorry. I was asking a question.
- 18 MR. DE BIE: Board Member Eaton called out --
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just the section.
- 20 MR. DE BIE: -- C1 and then I was just reading
- 21 down further to C3 that's on page 2 of the regs where it
- 22 indicates that it is the option of the LEA to have the
- 23 facility under an appropriate enforcement action as
- 24 described in 18084 to remedy any violation.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I'm trying to figure out if

- 1 this document can help us get us to where we want to go.
- 2 MR. DE BIE: It gets us a big chunk of the way
- 3 in two ways. One, it lays out the -- prescribes in much
- 4 more detail what the obligations of the LEA are relative
- 5 to enforcement, and it also lays out this criteria that
- 6 the Board can use to identify what -- when the LEA trips
- 7 and falls on their way towards enforcement and when we
- 8 can pick up the ball and move forward with it.
- 9 We didn't have that tool before in terms of
- 10 defining what is meant by appropriate enforcement action.
- 11 It was undefined, so an argument kept coming back from
- 12 LEAs saying I am taking enforcement action, it is
- 13 appropriate. But it wasn't defined before so there was a
- 14 constant argument about whether that was appropriate or
- 15 not.
- 16 We're defining appropriate enforcement action in
- 17 these regs, setting out the criteria so that the Board
- 18 can look at that and say no, you're not taking an
- 19 appropriate enforcement action and begin the process
- 20 towards taking direct enforcement action and maybe
- 21 de-designating the LEA.
- 22 There's two things that the Board can do. They
- 23 can take direct enforcement action on that facility and
- 24 would still have the LEA intact, not de-designate them,
- 25 or they can move towards de-designating the LEA or both.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: But we can't do that
- 2 without the local governing board.
- 3 MR. DE BIE: De-designating the LEA I believe
- 4 requires the governing board approval.
- 5 I think I'm going to speculate a little bit
- 6 here, but based on discussions with the LEAs, the
- 7 certification process that I'm recalling, I think what
- 8 we're looking at is giving the option of the local
- 9 agency, governing body, an ability to find another LEA
- 10 before we de-designate that.
- 11 So it's always been the emphasis in the past of
- 12 the Board to try to keep it local. So if an LEA is
- 13 failing, let's give the local governing authority ability
- 14 to find another LEA, maybe an adjacent County or
- 15 contracting with the State to do it before we
- 16 de-designate the LEA.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER EATON: If in January or some
- 18 future date this Board would have taken action along the
- 19 lines that have been mentioned in the previous item,
- 20 i.e., compliance schedules or LEA advisories, would this
- 21 be in the set of regulations that would be revised? Or
- 22 are you trying to create a whole new set?
- 23 MR. DE BIE: If we defined compliance schedule
- 24 through regulation, if that's the option that the Board
- 25 chooses, it would be within the scope of these regs, yes.

- MR. WALKER: Another thing I'd like to point out
- 2 is in Section 18350, the Board may take enforcement
- 3 action on their own and they do not need the local
- 4 governing body to allow them to do that. That applies to
- 5 an enforcement action the Board may decide to take on a
- 6 specific facility.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So we're caught sort of
- 8 holding the bag on these chronic violators?
- 9 MR. DE BIE: Only if you choose.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Do we have something
- 11 available to us that we're not exercising?
- 12 MS. NAUMAN: Mr. Eaton, if I might weigh in on
- 13 this one.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Absolutely. Please.
- MS. NAUMAN: On the bottom of page 20, the
- 16 language that Scott Walker was just referring you to,
- 17 beginning on line 43 is where the Board has the option in
- 18 the case of eminent threat to public health or safety the
- 19 Board could take the enforcement action. Just for
- 20 clarification, the section that you cited to us earlier,
- 21 18351, which involves the concurrence of the local
- 22 governing board, that's a mandate to the Board,
- 23 subsection A, talking about the Board shall assume the
- 24 duties.
- 25 So it's two different situations here. One

- 1 where the Board shall assume and then I think what you're
- 2 exploring with us more is under what circumstances may we
- 3 go in and assume responsibility for a particular facility
- 4 or particular violation.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Here's my fear, simply a
- 6 fear. It may be unfounded. This chronic violator list
- 7 has been around for a long time, but we have a situation
- 8 where we have a list of chronic violators, for whatever
- 9 reason, and let's just take Perkins Road. Let's say they
- 10 were on this chronic violator's list and that fire that's
- 11 out there caught on fire to explode that gas.
- 12 Now, what would this Board look like? That's
- 13 what I'm trying to hedge against is those
- 14 once-in-a-lifetime situations and minimize through
- 15 whatever means we have to bring it to a head. That's
- 16 what I'm looking at. What is it that we do, that we as a
- 17 Board do so that we don't sort of just rubber stamp
- 18 chronic violators and it comes back and it's an
- 19 embarrassment through some catastrophic event?
- 20 That goes to your necessary -- it's after the
- 21 fact that we would be acting in eminent harm because the
- 22 fire would already be started and the gas is already
- 23 migrating. I know it's a delicate balance because
- 24 Mr. Jones raises a valid point, but sometimes the LEA
- 25 doesn't know the recourse because the local governing

- 1 body has their hand. So that's the one instance I'm
- 2 trying to protect. If I was an insurance person, I
- 3 probably wouldn't insure the risk.
- 4 MS. TOBIAS: Can I --
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: That's what I think I'm
- 6 trying to get at. I can't speak for everyone else.
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: Could I suggest that we look at
- 8 this over lunch time and take this up right after lunch?
- 9 I'm looking at this --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I knew I would get
- 11 Mr. DeBie on his challenge that he thought he was
- 12 through.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Right. I think that
- 14 would be a good idea so the Members will all have a
- 15 chance to read and review it a little more under this
- 16 light. Thank you, Mr. Eaton, for bringing that up. Is
- 17 that okay with you, Mr. Eaton?
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Absolutely.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Works for me, too.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Is that okay,
- 21 Mr. DeBie?
- MR. DE BIE: That's fine. I'll be here.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: How long do we need?
- 24 An hour and a half? We have to be out by 4:00. We
- 25 should be back no later than 1:45.

- 1 (Lunch recess taken.)
- 2 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Good afternoon.
- 3 Mr. Leary, I apologize.
- 4 MR. LEARY: No problem.
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We're still on 21.
- 6 Mr. DeBie.
- 7 MS. TOBIAS: Madam Chair, do you want to do ex
- 8 partes?
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes. Ex partes.
- 10 Mr. Eaton. Thank you.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Nothing to report.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones, any ex
- 13 partes?
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: No.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: No.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Medina.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: None to report.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: And I have none.
- 20 Okay. We'll get started then.
- 21 MR. DE BIE: Staff considered the discussion
- 22 prior to lunch and want to bring a little more clarity to
- 23 the issue to the Board, and I think we're there in terms
- 24 of where the regulations are relative to statute. So if
- 25 you bear with me, I'll walk you through a couple sections

- 1 in the regulations and then refer to a statute relative
- 2 to the Board's ability to remove designation approval to
- 3 the LEA.
- 4 As brought out prior to breaking for lunch,
- 5 there was some questions about the Board's ability to
- 6 take direct enforcement action if the LEA is failing to
- 7 do so or if there's other issues associated with the
- 8 site, as well as the Board's ability to remove the
- 9 designation or de-designate an LEA.
- 10 I'll call your attention to page 20 of the
- 11 regulations and Section 18350, enforcement actions by the
- 12 Board, which basically outlines a process for the Board
- 13 to take direct enforcement action where the LEA fails to
- 14 implement their enforcement program plan. So one of the
- 15 criteria in this is eminent threat, but it's not the only
- 16 one. So there can be a situation where the LEA has
- 17 failed to implement their enforcement program plan, to
- 18 take appropriate enforcement action, and the Board can
- 19 follow this process outlined in A1, 2 and 3 in taking
- 20 direct enforcement action.
- 21 The criteria that the Board would use to
- 22 evaluate whether the LEA is carrying out the proper
- 23 enforcement action is outlined in 18084, which is on page
- 24 5. It starts on page 5 and continues to page 6 which is
- 25 LEA duties, responsibilities for enforcement, and on D,

- 1 Section D, it says if the LEA fails to take appropriate
- 2 enforcement action to cause the operator to correct
- 3 violations or abate eminent threat to public health and
- 4 safety, the Board may take appropriate enforcement action
- 5 pursuant to the PRC Codes which talk about enforcement
- 6 actions, and we are to use criteria one and if necessary
- 7 criteria two in evaluating whether or not the LEA has
- 8 taken out appropriate enforcement actions.
- 9 So this is where we're defining what appropriate
- 10 enforcement actions are, which was missing prior to these
- 11 regulations. There wasn't the yardstick defined on how
- 12 to evaluate the LEAs. So through those two regulatory
- 13 sections, it's clear I think that the Board has the
- 14 authority to step in and take enforcement action
- 15 directly.
- 16 Relative to the Board's ability to address the
- 17 LEA through a designation process, statute in 43215 --
- 18 this is the PRC Code -- speaks to the Board's ability to
- 19 take -- to withdraw its designation of the LEA. So if
- 20 you bear with me, I'll read quickly through Section A.
- 21 If the Board in conducting inspection and
- 22 performance reviews required pursuant to 43214 of this
- 23 section finds that the enforcement agency is not
- 24 fulfilling one or more of its responsibilities, the Board
- 25 shall notify the enforcement agency of the particular

- 1 reasons for finding that the enforcement agency is not
- 2 fulfilling its responsibilities and of the Board's
- 3 intention to withdraw its approval of the designation if
- 4 within a time to be specified in the notification, but in
- 5 no event less than 30 days, the enforcement agency does
- 6 not take the corrective action specified by the Board.
- 7 So the Board, after noticing the LEA of its
- 8 intent, can begin the process to remove the designation
- 9 of the LEA and that process is being better defined in a
- 10 reg package that's in development and will be coming to
- 11 the Board early next year.
- 12 Relative to the section that Board Member Eaton
- 13 brought out, which was 18305 -- I'm sorry. I was doing
- 14 so well too. 18350, I believe. Enforcement action by
- 15 the Board -- no, that was it. Assumption of duties.
- 16 18351, assumption of duties.
- 17 Upon lunch time reflection on this regulation,
- 18 what it's indicating is there are some situations where
- 19 the Board is obligated to take on the LEA enforcement
- 20 activities, and that's if a local governing body has an
- 21 agreement with the Board then the Board shall take over
- 22 as the LEA or if there's a withdrawal of the designation
- 23 and there's no new LEA designated. So in some
- 24 circumstances the Board by this requirement shall be
- 25 obligated to take over as LEA when there is no LEA, but

- 1 again I refer back to the statute that says that the
- 2 Board can in any situation after noticing find that if
- 3 the LEA is not fulfilling its responsibilities, can step
- 4 in and start the process to de-designate. I think that
- 5 addresses the issues relative to enforcement action and
- 6 de-designation.
- 7 The issue of defining compliance schedule, I
- 8 think we need to talk with stakeholders about that and
- 9 define that and hopefully we can bring something in
- 10 January. I'm confident we can bring something in January
- 11 that talks about how best to address that particular
- 12 situation, and we did discuss this at lunch with legal
- 13 staff and there are several options including regulation
- 14 but not necessarily regulations as the only method that
- 15 we could use.
- 16 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Eaton, did you
- 17 have any further comments or questions?
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: It clarifies for the record
- 19 in case there's any kind of discrepancy on how the
- 20 sections of the regulations interplay in that one does
- 21 not prevail over the other in the sense of assumption of
- 22 duties or responsibilities and/or being able to take
- 23 actions independent of any other local governing body.
- 24 It's nice to read them.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you for bringing

- 1 that up.
- 2 MR. DE BIE: That helps to read them once in a
- 3 while.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. DeBie.
- 5 MR. DE BIE: So the Board would like to
- 6 recommend adoption of the two resolutions -- I'm sorry.
- 7 Staff would like to recommend. I'm a bit flustered. B
- 8 first and then A.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. We need a
- 10 motion Resolution 2000-445B, adoption of a Negative Dec.
- 11 Moved by Mr. Jones. I'll second it.
- 12 We have a motion by Mr. Jones, seconded by
- 13 Moulton-Patterson, to approve Resolution 2000-445B.
- 14 Please call the roll.
- 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 19 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 21 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 24 Moulton-Patterson.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair.
- 2 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption of
- 4 Resolution 2000-445A, consideration of adoption -- is
- 5 that right? For a Neg Dec for this packet.
- 6 MR. DE BIE: The regs. The title of the
- 7 resolutions are very similar but the action is actually
- 8 on A is to -- or B is to -- on A is to adopt the
- 9 regulations.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Jones.
- 11 I'll second to approve Resolution -- moved by Mr. Jones,
- 12 seconded by Moulton-Patterson, to approve Resolution
- 13 2000-445A.
- 14 Can we substitute the previous roll? Okay.
- Now you're finished for sure.
- MR. DE BIE: Thank you.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay.
- Mr. Leary.
- 19 MR. LEARY: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Members
- 20 of the Board. My name is Mark Leary representing the
- 21 Special Waste Division.
- 22 Before I begin, let me first express my
- 23 appreciation for your very kind comments earlier today in
- 24 regards to Senate Bill 876.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

- 1 MR. LEARY: I think you and the rest of the
- 2 Board appropriately recognized it was a team effort. It
- 3 was recognized in the all-staff meeting and it was a
- 4 pleasure to be a part of that team. I think Terry
- 5 Jordan's staff is still back at the office preparing
- 6 spreadsheets because no one told them it wasn't part of
- 7 their regular work, that they had to do it every day. It
- 8 seems like they crank those things out every day.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Very good job. Thank
- 10 you.
- 11 MR. LEARY: Anyway, Agenda Item 22 is
- 12 consideration of approval of the proposed evaluation
- 13 process for the fiscal year 2000-2001 park playground
- 14 accessibility and recycling grant program.
- As the Board I'm sure will recall, in March of
- 16 this year the voters of the state of California
- 17 authorized the Board to administer a grant program
- 18 through the Park Bond Act that grants to local agencies
- 19 to assist them in meeting state and federal accessibility
- 20 standards and provided us \$7 million to do that.
- 21 In this year's Budget Act, the Legislature
- 22 appropriated \$2.5 million for this grant cycle and it's
- 23 contingent upon the local agencies' guarantee that
- 24 they'll provide 50 percent and that \$50,000 -- the grants
- 25 shall not exceed \$50,000.

- 1 In August of this year you approved the
- 2 distribution of funds, the applicant and project
- 3 eligibility, and the scoring criteria for this grant
- 4 program. We are here today to ask for your indulgence in
- 5 another consideration in regards to reviewing these grant
- 6 applications and that's the blind review process.
- 7 As the Board will recall, in December of '98
- 8 they approved a basic blind review process that provides
- 9 that 10 percent of all grant applications are reviewed in
- 10 a grant cycle and that the group scores of those 10
- 11 percent should be within five points of each other, but
- 12 the Board has also recognized under subsequent grant
- 13 considerations for the Playground Act that when you have
- 14 a large pool of applicants like we've had in the
- 15 Playground Act and we will expect again with the Park
- 16 Bond Act, that 10 percent is an enormous number when you
- 17 have 400 applications.
- 18 So what we're asking in this item is for the
- 19 Board to consider streamlining the evaluation process
- 20 much like you did in the Playground Safety and Recycling
- 21 Act grant program and allow us to -- we proposed actually
- 22 two different options.
- 23 The first option is to create a post-scoring
- 24 review team that will review the score sheets and
- 25 applications for all applications with scores of three

- 1 points or less within the 70 percent passing score, the
- 2 70-point passing score. That is, any application that
- 3 scores between 67 and 73 this post-scoring review team
- 4 will review carefully to make sure there are no
- 5 discrepancies, and if there are, to rescore those
- 6 applications to make sure we have the boundary line of
- 7 what's passing and what fails very well defined and sound
- 8 in our evaluation.
- 9 The second option is kind of a mini blind review
- 10 in that we will take five applications and -- or 10
- 11 percent, whichever is less, for the blind review and
- 12 conduct the blind review much like we normally would
- 13 otherwise.
- 14 We are recommending option number one because we
- 15 think it concentrates on what we think is the important
- 16 matter, that is which is those that will score within
- 17 three points of the passing score and will allow staff
- 18 flexibility while not sacrificing comprehensiveness in
- 19 our evaluation.
- 20 So we are recommending approval of option one
- 21 and seek your support to adopt Resolution 2000-447.
- 22 That concludes my presentation. Any questions?
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Any questions for
- 24 Mr. Leary? Hearing none.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair. Never mind.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'd like to move
- 3 Resolution 2000-447, approval of the proposed evaluation
- 4 process for fiscal year 2000-2001 park playground
- 5 accessibility and recycling grant program.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 8 Mr. Paparian, seconded by Mr. Medina, to approve
- 9 Resolution 2000-447, option one.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's with option one.
- 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Would you please call
- 12 the roll.
- 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 15 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 19 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 21 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 22 Moulton-Patterson.
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Leary, Item Number
- 24 23.
- 25 MR. LEARY: Agenda Item 23 will be presented by

- 1 Shirley Willd-Wagoner.
- MS. WILLD-WAGONER: Good afternoon, Chair
- 3 Moulton-Patterson and Board Members. I'm Shirley
- 4 Willd-Wagoner of the Used Oil and Household Hazardous
- 5 Waste Branch, and Item Number 23 is staff recommendations
- 6 for the award of the fourth cycle used oil non-profit
- 7 grants.
- 8 As you're aware, the California Oil Recycling
- 9 Enhancement Act authorizes the Board to collect a fee
- 10 from oil manufacturers on the sales of new lubricating
- 11 oil to fund certain activities discouraging the illegal
- 12 disposal of used oil. The non-profit grants are one of
- 13 the activities specified in the Act.
- 14 In April, the Board approved the scoring
- 15 criteria and evaluation process for scoring of these
- 16 grants as attachment one in your item. Subsequently, the
- 17 Notice of Funding Availability was circulated to over 800
- 18 parties and noticed on the Board's web site, and 30 grant
- 19 applications were received for a total of \$5.7 million.
- 20 Three review panels were formed and we followed
- 21 the blind review process as has been done in the past
- 22 that was passed in December of '98. 10 percent of the
- $23\,$ grants, which is three applications, were blind reviewed.
- 24 The Grants Administration Unit reviewed the outcome of
- 25 those blind reviewed applications and determined that

- 1 they were all within the five-point limit and the
- 2 recommendation to fund or not fund was the same in all
- 3 cases.
- 4 Attachment 2 is listing in rank order for your
- 5 consideration all of the merged scores and applications
- 6 and present staff funding recommendations. At the moment
- 7 or at the current picture of the used oil fund, a little
- 8 over \$2 million is available, so we're recommending that
- 9 the first 10 applications be funded for \$2,020,782. And
- 10 then the next 10 have also received passing scores and
- 11 the resolution is worded so that staff is requesting that
- 12 the Board authorize staff to enter into grant agreements
- 13 if additional funds become available in the order listed
- 14 in your resolution.
- 15 So staff recommends adoption of Resolution
- 16 2000-448. If you have any other questions, I can review
- 17 any of the specific applications if you would like.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: In terms of the second
- 20 10, the ones that there's not enough funding for yet, is
- 21 there any discretion as to which ones of those will get
- 22 funding? Is it strictly in the order on the list?
- 23 MS. WILLD-WAGONER: The order on the list is the
- 24 way they were scored, yes. Actually next month staff
- 25 will come to the Board with a full picture of the whole

- 1 used oil condition and we might be able to see how many
- 2 of those we would fund.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: So none of them were
- 4 actually equal so you would have to make a choice between
- 5 one and another?
- 6 MS. WILLD-WAGONER: I don't believe any of them
- 7 were equal. I Love A Clean San Diego, there was a --
- 8 there is -- yes, there are a couple that are actually
- 9 within the same point total. American Truck Historical
- 10 Society and Heal The Bay are the same, and I Love A Clean
- 11 San Diego and Santa Monica Bay Restoration are the same
- 12 also.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I think I would feel
- 14 more comfortable going with the first ten we have the
- 15 funding for and coming back on the second ten when we
- 16 know how much money is going to be available.
- MS. WILLD-WAGONER: We could also do that.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Because there may be a
- 19 situation if you get down to the bottom four there of
- 20 having to make a hard choice between a couple that are
- 21 equally scored. Does the Board have an opportunity,
- 22 Counsel, if two of them are scored equally? Does the
- 23 Board have that opportunity to make that decision or no?
- 24 MS. TOBIAS: Let me answer that a different way
- 25 and see if this answers your question. Basically I don't

- 1 think the Board can delegate the discretion to staff to
- 2 pick one over the other if only one could be chosen in a
- 3 tie. You could either have them bring the whole list
- 4 back or you could have them bring the list back when it
- 5 gets down to that point. That would be the Board's
- 6 decision as to how to decide what to do in the case of a
- 7 tie.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: So the Board can make
- 9 that choice if there's a tie. I think going with the
- 10 first 10 that we have the funding for I'm comfortable
- 11 with. I would like to hold back on the second 10 until
- 12 we know how much money there is and what we're going to
- 13 be able to fund.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: What are the grant
- 15 requirements under the scoring so if there's a challenge
- 16 if you did that on the second 10?
- MS. TOBIAS: In the grant --
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: It's been established that
- 19 that's the priority order.
- 20 MS. TOBIAS: I think what the Board would have
- 21 to decide to do at that time is decide how to handle a
- 22 tie in that situation. If you have enough money to fund
- 23 all of them, of course, that makes it pretty easy. If
- 24 you don't, then I think the staff will have to come back
- 25 with a proposal to the Board on how to handle a tie if

- 1 they have exactly the same points and there's not enough
- 2 money to fund them all.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Did you wish to
- 4 make -- were there any other questions? Did you wish to
- 5 make a motion, Mr. Paparian, to see if there's agreement?
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'd like to move with
- 7 modification Resolution 2000-448, approval of fiscal year
- 8 2000-2001 fourth cycle used oil non-profit grant awards
- 9 with the modification being on the second page of the
- 10 resolution, the second batch of 10, and the descriptive
- 11 sentence above that being X'd out of the resolution so
- 12 that the resolution would then be to fund the 10 projects
- 13 for which we have the funding for right now.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Are you saying that you
- 15 will bring all 10 back in the second even though the one,
- 16 Save Our Shores for 69, Sports Cars of America scored 65,
- 17 you would say you wanted to bring them back and decide
- 18 between the two of them or only if there's a tie?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Because of the situation
- 20 where we don't know how much more funding we're going to
- 21 have, I think the easiest way of handling this rather
- 22 than arbitrarily cutting off somewhere down this list,
- 23 come back and see how much money is available.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER EATON: You have a legal
- 25 obligation. If someone scores 69 and someone scores 65,

- 1 you can't move the 65 up over the 69 if the funding
- 2 becomes available.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I understand that.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So is that what you're
- 5 saying? That's what I need to know.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: No, I'm not saying that.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER EATON: You're saying you want them
- 8 all put into the pool no matter what they scored?
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'm saying I would like
- 10 the staff to come back when we know how much money we
- 11 have and how far down the list we're going to be able to
- 12 go before we reach that point, have the staff come back
- 13 with a resolution on funding those proposals. If we
- 14 reach a situation where we have to make a choice between
- 15 two proposals that received equal scoring, then I think
- 16 we're going to have to address at that point how we're
- 17 going to choose between those that got equal scoring.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Then the motion should be
- 19 bring back only those in the case of a tie because that
- 20 would be one reason to bring those back.
- 21 MS. TOBIAS: I hear --
- 22 BOARD MEMBER EATON: If all the others have
- 23 scored higher, you can't move anyone up on the list that
- 24 was lower over another one.
- 25 MS. TOBIAS: I hear --

- BOARD MEMBER EATON: Because this was -- wasn't
- 2 this one that went out and was graded and so on and so
- 3 forth. It's not like a discretionary project to fund.
- 4 We've been challenged on this before I think.
- 5 MS. TOBIAS: And what I hear the motion as is
- 6 that for two reasons Board Member Paparian is bringing
- 7 these back. One is to see how far down we might be able
- 8 to get, and secondarily, if we get all the way to the
- 9 bottom how to choose between those ties; is that correct?
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Correct.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And I'm just saying that
- 12 what's the reason for the first part of how far you're
- 13 going to go down? It doesn't make a difference. If you
- 14 have extra money available, you just go down the list.
- 15 That's what proper, fair and equitable under the process
- 16 of establishing the California grant process.
- 17 MS. FISH: Unless the Board just wanted to see
- 18 how far we could go, to know which projects are approved.
- 19 And that could be done in a report unless the Board want
- 20 to know actually which projects are being funded or not.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I don't think you want to
- 22 go down that road of playing with grants and the process
- 23 of scoring.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Well --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: I'm not suggesting that

- 1 at all. I would just like to know what we're -- I'd like
- 2 to have it clear that the Board is going to know what
- 3 we're going to be able to fund and that if we get to the
- 4 point where there are equally scored items how we make
- 5 the decision between those equally scored items.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And that would be -- and
- 7 those are the last four.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Right.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So go all the way down to
- 10 the Sports Cars of America because you can't touch the
- 11 ones above it under the grant process. So I mean if you
- 12 want to just put off the inevitable, that's fine too.
- 13 That's what you're doing. But there's no way you can go
- 14 above those four. If the motion is just to put off the
- 15 inevitable --
- MS. WILLD-WAGONER: I have one more piece --
- 17 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I want to be sure the
- 18 motion is clear that we're not moving people up or going
- 19 to come up at another time because they were scored in a
- 20 fair and equitable manner.
- 21 MS. FISH: But there's also no guarantee there's
- 22 going to be additional money. That's the other thing.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER EATON: That's not an issue.
- 24 That's not the issue.
- 25 MS. WILLD-WAGONER: Just one more piece of

- 1 information. In reviewing my list it looks like two of
- 2 the top people on the list, Save Our Shores and Water
- 3 Education Foundation, also received a tied score, but
- 4 what Mr. Paparian is asking is that we would come back
- 5 with the entire list of 10 and then we would be able to
- 6 know whether there's going to be enough money to fund how
- 7 far down to any -- covering any ties or not.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: That actually changes it
- 9 substantially. Two out of three on the top of the
- 10 list --
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Right. You can't choose
- 12 between those two and fund anything below that. That's
- 13 what the grant process is saying. I'm just trying to
- 14 ensure that those who scored higher, that's to maintain
- 15 the integrity of the grant process.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: We're in full agreement
- 17 on that. I don't think there's any disagreement there.
- 18 For the items that have equal scoring and we have a
- 19 limited pot of money, I think we should have a role in
- 20 determining the process --
- 21 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And that was what my motion
- 22 was for clarification, that the list could be approved
- 23 absent those that have ties, but you make the motion.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: We could modify it that
- 25 way, but then you would need some further clarification

- 1 on language I think from what you just said. But items 2
- 2 and 3 on the agenda that are on that list are among the
- 3 ones that are tied. So we could -- it's possible we
- 4 could reach this issue very quickly.
- 5 I think a simpler, cleaner way would be to drop
- 6 the second list for now and come back when we know how
- 7 much money there is. And again, it's in the record
- 8 several times. We're in agreement that you fund them in
- 9 the order based on the scoring. The intention here is
- 10 for the ones that are equal scoring how you determine
- 11 which ones to fund if you have to make that decision.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I don't hear a second.
- 13 Do you want to modify it or does somebody else have a
- 14 motion?
- 15 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I don't have a motion.
- 16 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm talking about
- 17 Mr. Paparian's motion.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Read the motion again.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: The motion is fairly
- 20 simple. To fund the first 10 items that we have the
- 21 funding for, Resolution 2000-448, and then to remove
- 22 those second 10 items with the understanding that those
- 23 will come back when we know how much money is available
- 24 and how far down that list we might be able to go.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I'll second it.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I have a question
- 2 before we vote.
- 3 We have a motion by Mr. Paparian, seconded by
- 4 Senator Roberti.
- 5 Say we had gone with the recommendation and
- 6 we -- how would you -- how would staff have decided a
- 7 tie?
- 8 MS. WILLD-WAGONER: I believe that we would have
- 9 either funded all or none of the ties. So if the money
- 10 ran out part way through the tie, it would have been
- 11 either all of the grants at that score or none of the
- 12 grants at that score would have received the recommended
- 13 amount.
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: In order.
- MS. WILLD-WAGONER: Absolutely in order.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER EATON: We have always in the past
- 17 robbed from Peter in those cases where there was a tie,
- 18 and rather than trying to choose one or the other, fund
- 19 money to fund all of them which protected the integrity
- 20 of the process against challenge.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 22 Mr. Paparian, seconded by Senator Roberti, to approve
- 23 Resolution 2000-448.
- 24 Secretary, please call the roll.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.

Jones.

1

2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye. 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina. BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye. 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian. BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye. 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti. BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye. 8 9 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson. 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye. BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair. 11 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones. 12 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: It was a good debate 14 because I know what Mr. Eaton is trying to protect. I 15 have one question that doesn't have to be dealt with now 16 but maybe we could get a copy of the point totals for 17 each of these ones that are on the list at some point just so that we know the points that they scored. 18 Actually I wouldn't mind seeing it for the whole page, 19 just get an idea of who got an 80 and who got a 70. 21 MS. WILLD-WAGONER: We provided you a summary of each of the jurisdictions that are being served, the 23 calculations. So we'll just add the points to that 24 chart. How about that? 25 Thank you.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Before we go forward,
- 2 I held the roll open for Senator Roberti on Item 21 on
- 3 Resolution 2000-445B and Resolution 200-445A and Item 22.
- 4 Did you wish to vote on those?
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Secretary, please call
- 7 the roll.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: On 22, Roberti.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Aye for both A and B on 21?
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Right. Aye.
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 15 Item 24.
- 16 MR. LEARY: Agenda Item 24 is consideration of
- 17 approval of sites under the waste tire stabilization and
- 18 abatement program. Board staff is requesting approval of
- 19 the Royster waste tire site for remediation under the
- 20 waste tire stabilization and abatement program.
- 21 As the Board will recall, on August 7th, 1998,
- 22 nearly 7 million tires were ignited and burned at the
- 23 Royster waste tire site. There was limited success in
- 24 the fire suppression efforts in the past and as a result
- 25 the fire continues to burn.

- Board staff is requesting authorization to use
- 2 the waste tire stabilization and abatement program funds
- 3 to complete the fire suppression efforts at the Royster
- 4 waste tire site and ultimately set the stage for further
- 5 cleanup actions in the future.
- 6 With that, Board staff recommends adoption of
- 7 Resolution 2000-452 which creates approximately \$364,925
- 8 for fire suppression efforts at the Royster waste tire
- 9 site in San Joaquin County, California.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: And you're
- 11 recommending option one.
- 12 MR. LEARY: There's only one option.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Excuse me?
- 14 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Have we worked out the
- 15 legal issues regarding air?
- 16 MS. TOBIAS: There's a section in the Health and
- 17 Safety Code, Section 25400, which provides an immunity
- 18 for public entities in taking an action in these types of
- 19 situations. Essentially what it does is present a broad
- 20 finding and says that what the Legislature provides is a
- 21 qualified immunity because they would rather have the
- 22 problem cleaned up than to not have it cleaned up and
- 23 have entities arguing over who has some kind of liability
- 24 or responsibility or whatever.
- 25 So what it does is basically says that where

- 1 there is a threat to the public health and safety because
- 2 of a discharge, spill or presence of hazardous substances
- 3 on public or private property, that there is a qualified
- 4 immunity from liability that's provided for public
- 5 entities. The definitions are very broad. Hazardous
- 6 substance means a substance that presents a threat to the
- 7 public because of toxicity, radioactivity, flammability
- 8 or other characteristics dangerous to the public health
- 9 and environment.
- 10 It also defines eminent peril to include a
- 11 peril, which if not mitigated, threatens the public
- 12 health or welfare or the environment. And so I think
- 13 under that section that we would have that qualified
- 14 immunity.
- 15 There's also a section in the Government Code
- 16 that provides that where a public entity is -- that
- 17 neither a public entity is liable for any injury
- 18 resulting from condition of fire protection or fire
- 19 fighting equipment or facilities for any injury caused in
- 20 fighting fires. I think that's less good and less broad
- 21 for our purposes, but I think the other one will protect
- 22 the Board when they take an action in this case.
- 23 I do want to say that the Board has attained a
- 24 judgment against the Royster estate as of yesterday. I
- 25 think based on both the fact that we have a judgment

- 1 against the estate and this particular section provides
- 2 that protection of liability.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER EATON: When are we going to begin
- 4 work?
- 5 MR. LEARY: With your authorization and your
- 6 adoption of this resolution we'll start to initiate the
- 7 detailed planning that will be involved with this. I
- 8 would hope that we would be able to complete this in a
- 9 fairly expeditious fashion and we could be on-site as
- 10 soon as two to three weeks from now, but that's
- 11 conditioned on our ability to do a good health and safety
- 12 program but that considers both on-site and off-site
- 13 emission monitoring as well as a good media and community
- 14 outreach event in advance of actually conducting the fire
- 15 suppression efforts, and to get good, reputable, strong
- 16 contractors with expertise in fire suppression of these
- 17 kinds on board and ready to go that soon.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So we wouldn't be using our
- 19 regular tire contractor.
- 20 MR. LEARY: We'll use Sukut as our general
- 21 contractor and we'll ask them to retain specialty
- 22 subcontractors in fire suppression efforts. So we'll tap
- 23 the existing contract with the existing funds then direct
- 24 them to secure the services of the appropriate
- 25 subcontracts.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And you'll have the final
- 2 say over that subcontractor?
- 3 MR. LEARY: Absolutely. Absolutely. But in
- 4 piggy-backing on what -- on Chief Counsel Tobias's
- 5 comments, from a technical perspective we will not
- 6 conduct this activity unless we can do it safely, unless
- 7 we can do it in a way that does not in any way worsen the
- 8 current situation, and if we can't do that I will be back
- 9 before you suggesting that we couldn't go forward for
- 10 those reasons.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And let us know in addition
- 12 to the citizens in case we get a call.
- 13 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: You said probably two
- 14 to three weeks to get the plans and all. How long do you
- 15 anticipate it will take to do the work?
- 16 MR. LEARY: I think it's a matter of days, 24 or
- 17 48 hours certainly. It's minimal enough that we can
- 18 probably suppress it pretty quickly with all the right
- 19 equipment in place and moving forward. It's kind of the
- 20 thing once you start, you don't stop, you get it done.
- 21 Then we will leave.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Any questions?
- Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair, I'd like to
- 25 move adoption of Resolution 2000-452, consideration of

- 1 approval of the Royster site for waste tire stabilization
- 2 grant.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Motion by Mr. Jones.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Second.
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Seconded by Mr. Medina
- 6 to approve Resolution 2000-452.
- 7 Please call the roll.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 14 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 16 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- MR. LEARY: Thank you.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 22 Local Assistance and Planning.
- 23 MR. SCHIAVO: Madam Chair, Board Members, Pat
- 24 Schiavo of the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance
- 25 Division.

- 1 Item Number 27 is consideration of a request to
- 2 extend the completeness due date for the Ventura County
- 3 Siting Element and Summary Plan.
- 4 In 1995, Ventura County submitted their Siting
- 5 Element and Summary Plan. However, it didn't meet the
- 6 conditions of CEQA as approved -- as the Board would like
- 7 it to be considered. There is a disagreement that took a
- 8 couple of years to resolve between Ventura County and the
- 9 Board.
- 10 In the beginning of 1998, the Board approved a
- 11 modified schedule for Ventura County. However, because
- 12 of various unforeseen reasons, the County could not
- 13 complete the plan on time. They also requested and were
- 14 approved by the Board a couple of extensions to their
- 15 completeness due date. This particular instance the
- 16 County wants to be extended until February 15th, 2001.
- 17 Board staff is recommending approval of the
- 18 extension to February 15th, 2001. However, if it is not
- 19 completed at that time, Board staff would like to come
- 20 forward with a proposal to take the particular County to
- 21 hearing if again that date is not satisfied.
- 22 A representative of the Ventura County is here
- 23 if you have any additional questions for them. And that
- 24 concludes my presentation.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm sure you said

- 1 this, but they've been granted two previous time
- 2 extensions?
- 3 MR. SCHIAVO: Yes.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Questions? Comments?
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Madam Chair.
- 6 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: February 15th and then
- 8 that's the drop-dead date.
- 9 MR. SCHIAVO: That's it.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll move adoption of
- 11 Resolution 2000-451, consideration of a request to extend
- 12 the completeness due date for Ventura's Countywide Siting
- 13 Element and Summary Plan.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Motion by Mr. Jones,
- 16 seconded by Mr. Paparian, to approve Resolution 2000-451.
- 17 Please call the roll.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.

- BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 5 Okay. Item 28.
- 6 MR. SCHIAVO: Staff will go ahead and present
- 7 themselves and then introduce speakers on the next two
- 8 items.
- 9 MS. LAMBERT: Good afternoon, Chair Person
- 10 Moulton-Patterson and Members of the Board. My name is
- 11 Kimya Lambert and I work in the Office of Local
- 12 Assistance.
- The item before you is an update on the status
- 14 of the approved scope of work for the rural cooperative
- 15 infrastructure development contract award to Del Norte
- 16 County. As discussed by RCRC this morning, rural
- 17 jurisdictions face certain challenges such as limited
- 18 resources and distance to markets in achieving
- 19 California's waste diversion goals.
- 20 Public Resources Code Sections 41787.3 et seq
- 21 require that the Board develop model programs and
- 22 materials to assist rural jurisdictions in achieving
- 23 California's waste diversion goals. The Del Norte Solid
- 24 Waste Management Authority developed a plan to implement
- 25 a model cooperative project with Humboldt County, and on

- 1 April 27th, 1999, the Board approved the scope of work
- 2 and funding for this project. The budget is set at
- 3 \$200,000 and the terms of the agreement is approximately
- 4 24 months commencing on June 2nd, 1999.
- 5 The Del Norte Humboldt cooperative model will
- 6 serve as a working tool kit designed specifically for a
- 7 region consisting of 19 rural counties. The scope of
- 8 work is divided into four phases: Initial cooperative
- 9 actions and coordinated research, developing and
- 10 analyzing the model, implementing and evaluating the
- 11 regional purchasing, recovery, processing and market
- 12 development plan, and finally delivery of a finished
- 13 product which would include, but not be limited to, the
- 14 model tool kit which will be designed for use by the
- 15 19-county region.
- 16 With that, I would like to introduce Kevin
- 17 Hendrick, the director of the Del Norte Solid Waste
- 18 Management Authority to provide an update of the status
- 19 on this contract.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.
- 21 MR. HENDRICK: Thank you, Kimya. I'll bet
- 22 everybody gets nervous when they do this.
- I have one hand-out that includes a cartoon. My
- 24 name is Kevin Hendrick. I'm the Director of the Del
- 25 Norte Solid Waste Management Authority and I'm here to

- 1 speak to you about the rural cooperative recycling
- 2 infrastructure development project, a name which was
- 3 developed for the express purpose of not having an
- 4 acronym.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And it's almost
- 6 comprehensible.
- 7 MR. HENDRICK: I gave you a Dilbert cartoon,
- 8 partially because I like Dilbert and partially because
- 9 it's extremely relevant to the subject today in my
- 10 presentation. And if you'll allow me for the benefit of
- 11 the people in the audience, I'll read aloud.
- 12 Dilbert talking to the pointy haired boss, which
- 13 looks too much like me, "How do I get rid of my old
- 14 computer," Dilbert asked his boss. "Why don't you give
- 15 it to a school, "he responds. Dilbert says, "Well, it
- 16 would take me a week to find someone to take it. The
- 17 hard drive is broken, it has no software, and it would
- 18 cause a tax accounting nightmare." The boss says, "Maybe
- 19 you could leave it on the school playground at night.
- 20 That's what I did with my old refrigerator." It ends
- 21 with Dilbert in the dead of the night dressed in black
- 22 dropping his computer on the top of the old refrigerator,
- 23 stating, "What I hate most is that I didn't have a better
- 24 idea."
- 25 That is the point. For one, it is in some ways

- 1 describes the state of recycling and diversion in rural
- 2 counties that the refrigerators and computers end up
- 3 somewhere else other than where they're supposed to be,
- 4 but probably more significant is that those are two items
- 5 that are currently being targeted for proposed programs
- 6 under this contract, the repair and recovery of computer
- 7 components and the repair and resale of white goods
- 8 including refrigerators.
- 9 As was mentioned in the introduction, this
- 10 project is a cooperation of the Del Norte Solid Waste
- 11 Management Authority, the Humboldt Waste Management
- 12 Authority, and the Regional Council Joint Powers
- 13 Authority, which are three regional agencies, to begin
- 14 with, working as a cooperative basis, and also under this
- 15 contract we have a subcontract with Center for
- 16 Environmental Economic Development which is providing a
- 17 lot of the hard work in developing this project.
- 18 We have several objectives. One is to build a
- 19 regional framework where we can build on and develop the
- 20 local policies and programs that we have developed
- 21 including the SRRE which was developed almost ten years
- 22 ago and more recently a zero waste plan which we prepared
- 23 for Del Norte County.
- 24 This plan was funded by a grant from the USDA
- 25 Forest Service and approved by the Board of Directors in

- 1 February of this year. Part of this plan in going beyond
- 2 50 percent is taking a look at our current snapshot of
- 3 our wastestream and identifying where there are service
- 4 opportunities and service voids; that is, do we have a
- 5 material that doesn't have a home, that doesn't have a
- 6 place to be recovered or -- which is a service void, or
- 7 do we have materials where there are opportunities that
- 8 still need to be taken advantage of. And that is the
- 9 heart of our objectives.
- 10 Included in this plan includes a proposal to
- 11 create a resource recovery park which is intended as an
- 12 incubator for recovery-based businesses I'll describe
- 13 later, but under this rural cooperative infrastructure
- 14 development program we plan on building on the successes
- 15 both in Del Norte County, Humboldt County, and the other
- 16 rural counties that were associated with the Regional
- 17 Council of Rural Counties.
- 18 The deliverable products as was mentioned
- 19 earlier include three things. One is developing a
- 20 specific plan for Humboldt and Del Norte County to guide
- 21 our regional efforts. Two is to adapt that plan to serve
- 22 as a model or guide for other rural counties that then
- 23 can be distributed through the Regional Council of Rural
- 24 Counties to the 20 other rural counties that are
- 25 involved.

- 1 And finally, and this was emphasized early on
- f 2 and f I think when f I met with some of you going into this,
- 3 to implement programs early and often, that there is
- 4 \$50,000 of this contract set aside for implementing
- 5 programs. And that's very important to us as we're
- 6 moving ahead planning to implement programs as we're
- 7 going along. The way that we plan on doing this and the
- 8 way that this is going to work in Del Norte County is
- 9 that we intend to build on values which are already
- 10 strongly held in rural communities. Can you hear me
- 11 okay?
- 12 (Laughter)
- 13 MR. HENDRICK: It's starting to sound like
- 14 "Jingle Bells" to me.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER EATON: The song is "Who Let The
- 16 Dogs Out."
- 17 MR. HENDRICK: Building on values that are
- 18 strongly held in rural communities including thriftiness
- 19 and self-reliance. This is important for not only our
- 20 landfill, our only landfill which we administer closes in
- 21 the year 2003. When that happens and we are in the
- 22 process of developing a transfer station, all of our
- 23 garbage will be shipped out to somebody else's landfill.
- 24 We need to be responsible for everything we can. We
- 25 believe that in the long run by being thrifty, by using

- 1 the resources rather than treating them as waste that we
- 2 will have a more efficient and more self-reliant system
- 3 for our county, and working regionally is what will help
- 4 to make that successful.
- 5 So we're developing a strategic plan that will
- 6 foster local recovery businesses, both in our county and
- 7 in the region. Specifically, the resource recovery park,
- 8 as a core of this project, is already an example of a
- 9 cooperative effort. We're working with a mill site reuse
- 10 program as a potential site for this facility. There is
- 11 a brown fields program that's taking contaminated mill
- 12 sites and trying to put them back into productive use.
- 13 This is a cooperative project with USEDA, USEPA,
- 14 California Trade and Commerce, California Toxic
- 15 Substances Control, and the Del Norte County Economic
- 16 Development Department. So we will be recycling this
- 17 mill site to reuse it as an incubator for recovery-based
- 18 businesses. We'll also working with the Cal Works Job
- 19 Creation Program to provide funding for this incubator
- 20 project, and in December we'll be applying for a
- 21 community development block grant to buy equipment for
- 22 our first start-up expansion business.
- 23 That first business will be a regional project
- 24 involving Saint Vincent de Paul which currently has an
- 25 operation in Eureka where they repair and remanufacture

- 1 mattresses. Our plan is to establish a satellite for
- 2 that non-profit in Crescent City so that we can start to
- 3 collect the white goods and the mattresses for repairing
- 4 the white goods in Crescent City, creating a projected
- 5 six jobs, training people to provide that service, and
- 6 shipping the mattresses back to Eureka where they can be
- 7 remanufactured.
- 8 Also, there's currently a proposal to start a
- 9 computer resale -- a repair and resale business in
- 10 Humboldt County also involving Saint Vincent de Paul and
- 11 the local Co-Op which has a new arm that they're calling
- 12 Bone Yard Computers, once again to establish a regional
- 13 program to collect, repair, remanufacture and resell or
- 14 recover or recycle computer parts.
- 15 In addition, to focus on some of these
- 16 non-traditional materials, this project also focuses on
- 17 the more traditional activities in recycling, and the
- 18 tasks in this contract include consolidating market and
- 19 incentive information on a regional basis, analyzing
- 20 transportation economics, defining components of
- 21 cooperative strategy, assessing potential for sharing
- 22 technology and resources, consolidating waste generation
- 23 information, together what do the two counties have,
- 24 looking at the voids and the service opportunities that
- 25 are present for the two counties, and then expanding the

- 1 Humboldt County RMDZ to include Del Norte County.
- 2 A very innovative program actually called
- 3 Innovators Forum is setting up a series of meetings where
- 4 we bring together players, participants and innovators to
- 5 come up with new ideas or providing a spur for new
- 6 businesses that can target those materials. As those
- 7 businesses are developed, expanding this contract also
- 8 includes an expansion of the Recycle Store, which is a
- 9 great program that was started by this Board to promote
- 10 recycling-based products.
- 11 Finally, compiling -- finally, finally, finally,
- 12 buying recycled. We all need to commit to buying
- 13 recycled, not only our county, our region and all the
- 14 other rural counties, as an example, and this is a small
- 15 example, Humboldt County recently had a truckload sale to
- 16 buy composters. We didn't have enough to buy -- to bring
- 17 in a whole truckload, so we cooperated. And when I leave
- 18 here, I am going to McKinleyville to pick up 30
- 19 composters to bring back to Del Norte County so we can
- 20 have those available locally.
- 21 All this information will then be compiled into
- 22 a final plan including Del Norte and Humboldt County. As
- 23 I mentioned earlier, that plan will be adapted to be able
- 24 to serve as a guide for other rural counties and
- 25 distributed through the Environmental Services Joint

- 1 Powers Authority including 20 counties in addition to Del
- 2 Norte County. When these plans are done, I look forward
- 3 to coming back to provide a final report and a final plan
- 4 for you.
- 5 In the way of what's next, two Innovators Forums
- 6 coming up, one focusing on reuse businesses which will be
- 7 November 8th and 10th, November 8th in Crescent City and
- 8 November 10th in Arcata, and a second Innovators Forum
- 9 focusing on construction and demolition.
- 10 In closing -- I apologize if I talk too fast.
- 11 I've got some adrenaline going here -- I want to thank
- 12 all of you, the California Integrated Waste Management
- 13 Board, all of your staff, for the support you've provided
- 14 to rural jurisdictions. In the time that I've worked for
- 15 a rural county, it has made a difference for us. Without
- 16 the grants and local assistance we would have never
- 17 achieved the success that we have today.
- 18 Finally I'd like all of you to visit in Del
- 19 Norte County if you get a chance. I'd be happy to show
- 20 you around. And at this point I'd answer any questions
- 21 you have.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much.
- 23 Any questions?
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Just one.
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Paparian.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Like all state agencies
- 2 the prison there is under a requirement to reduce their
- 3 waste by 50 percent. How have you done working with the
- 4 prison in their waste reduction efforts or do you have
- 5 any comments about that?
- 6 MR. HENDRICK: I can comment on that. We have a
- 7 fairly good working relationship with CDC and Pelican Bay
- 8 State Prison. It is strictly based on a level of
- 9 cooperation because they have very little mandate to
- 10 actually have to work with us. They have in the range of
- 11 the 30s as far as their recovery rate, which compares to
- 12 45 percent which is the county as a whole. So they're a
- 13 little bit lagging behind where we are as a whole.
- 14 We have ongoing discussions to look at possible
- 15 ways that we can help them to increase their -- just
- 16 recently actually as a spin-off to the last Innovators
- 17 Forumm, it focused on textiles. We were looking at that
- 18 Innovators Forum at bails of clothes they were coming out
- 19 of the Susanville Prison. So I went back to our own
- 20 prison officials to see if they would have similar types
- 21 of secondary textiles that we could be focusing on and,
- 22 in fact, they do have some.
- 23 So there's a general interest in finding ways
- 24 because it saves them money, and I think that's a
- 25 motivation for them. It is -- it has been in the past

- 1 difficult because there is no -- because they have
- 2 established themselves as separate sovereign entities
- 3 outside of our jurisdiction which makes it a little
- 4 difficult to plan, for example, future disposal because
- 5 they have no requirement to participate in our disposal
- 6 facilities yet we have an obligation to plan for them.
- 7 So we will move ahead and plan accordingly. And this is
- 8 a long answer to your question, but I hope it's
- 9 satisfactory.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Again, thank you very
- 11 much.
- 12 MR. HENDRICK: Thank you for providing us the
- 13 contract to be able to do this and I look forward to
- 14 talking to you again.
- 15 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Is the prison still an
- 17 exporter of its waste? Is it going to Oregon or is it
- 18 currently coming to your landfill?
- 19 MR. HENDRICK: It is currently coming to our
- 20 landfill. Yes, it is. That's fine with us. We know
- 21 where it's going, but that is -- it is a separate bidding
- 22 process for them. They hire a separate contractor to
- 23 haul it so they can go where they want. Any other
- 24 questions?
- 25 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I don't see any.

- 1 Thank you very much.
- MR. HENDRICK: Thank you for your time.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We're now on Item 29.
- 4 MS. MORGAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board
- 5 Members. My name is Cara Morgan, Office of Local
- 6 Assistance.
- 7 Item Number 29 is an oral presentation on the
- 8 update of the school district diversion project contract.
- 9 The Board, having a leadership role in working with
- 10 school districts pursuant to PRC 42620, approved the
- 11 contract at the May board meeting to focus on school
- 12 districts as an opportunity to pilot institutional
- 13 diversion concepts.
- 14 School districts are a good model as they have
- 15 central management of multiple sites and school districts
- 16 are distributed throughout the state. The objectives of
- 17 the contract approved by the Board are one, to develop a
- 18 model waste management system that evaluates the entire
- 19 materials management and waste practices of school
- 20 districts; to develop a program for the Board to transfer
- 21 this model to other school districts and local
- 22 jurisdictions throughout the state; to utilize the model
- 23 for other institutional settings; and, through the
- 24 development of the model, the team will be assessing the
- 25 business benefits such as cost savings for school

- 1 districts to implement waste reduction programs.
- 2 At this time the consultant for the project will
- 3 provide an update on the products completed to date and
- 4 the schedule for the remaining work products.
- 5 MR. WHITNEY: Good afternoon. Since we don't
- 6 have an overhead projector, I have some handouts if you'd
- 7 like to see them. My name is Clint Whitney. I'm with
- 8 RMG Associates. We're consultants to the Office of Local
- 9 Assistance on this project and I think I'd like to begin
- 10 our presentation by saying that the Office of Local
- 11 Assistance, Pat Schiavo, Cara and her staff, as well as
- 12 Bonnie Bruce who is serving right with us in most of our
- 13 committee meetings, have been an excellent staff to work
- 14 with and we rarely see such enthusiasm about a subject
- 15 matter but we certainly have it here. So we're trying to
- 16 take advantage of that.
- 17 We have, as Cara indicated, we're really trying
- 18 to take a good look at the business side of the school
- 19 business. Heretofore, you've spent a lot of time -- I
- 20 didn't frankly realize how much time your Board and its
- 21 staff specifically on the curriculum side have spent --
- 22 in schools, developing tools for schools, particularly in
- 23 the classroom to further the cause of AB 939 and waste
- 24 reduction objectives.
- On the other hand, there appears to be some

- 1 challenges ahead of us that haven't been addressed yet
- 2 that we're trying to discover and solve with this
- 3 project. First is just how to get access to the school
- 4 administrators. We've been fairly successful in talking
- 5 with teachers, talking with middle management staff,
- 6 operation staff, and we have actually instituted a lot of
- 7 projects, recycling programs over the last ten years.
- 8 Your files are full of those kinds of projects.
- 9 However, when we go back and look at some of
- 10 those projects, at least anecdotally -- we haven't made a
- 11 complete analysis of it -- many of those projects did not
- 12 sustain themselves primarily because what we call the
- 13 point of light person. That person that was enthusiastic
- 14 and made it happen got transferred, promoted or left the
- 15 district or the school and the program fell apart. I was
- 16 just informed of one just this last week in the City of
- 17 Antioch in which that very thing happened in an
- 18 elementary school district or in an elementary school I
- 19 should say.
- 20 The principal, chief custodian and the teachers
- 21 got together at the motivation of a citizen activist --
- 22 I might add that was a very important ingredient there --
- 23 put together a program this last year and it just fell
- 24 apart because the principal went to another district, the
- 25 custodian resigned for whatever reason, and the

- 1 superintendent of schools resigned. So therefore, the
- 2 top management, the business end of the district all of a
- 3 sudden wasn't there anymore.
- 4 Now the teachers were left standing alone,
- 5 trying to sustain the program. The reason it came to my
- 6 attention is because this citizen was referred to me that
- 7 maybe Antioch might be a good pilot district for us to
- 8 consider, and indeed we've got them in mind. However,
- 9 we've got a lot of evaluation to do there, which I'll get
- 10 into in just a moment.
- But the point I'm trying to make is we're
- 12 looking at the business end of the districts, not the
- 13 curriculum end. We're trying to show and prove, if we
- 14 can, that it is good business to have waste reduction,
- 15 recycling and the other AB 939 objectives. There are
- 16 three components that we discovered early on in our
- 17 thinking that have to come together in order for this to
- 18 happen.
- 19 First of all, we have to have the district's
- 20 attention at the right level and we're thinking that the
- 21 superintendents of schools and the chief business
- 22 officers, those are critical people that make the
- 23 decisions and guide their boards to adopt policies, that
- 24 then they can develop regulation and operational
- 25 procedures but then institutionalize the behavior of

- 1 everybody in the district. And so we're focusing on
- 2 those key positions.
- 3 Our mission is really to figure out how to
- 4 sustain these programs over time, not to just implement a
- 5 program and walk away and hope that it survives. We want
- 6 to try to find out what those keys are that gets it
- 7 started and then keeps it going, hopefully on a routine
- 8 basis because it's simply good business and they've
- 9 adopted the practices to make it happen on a daily basis
- 10 without a whole heck of a lot of thought about it.
- 11 The three components here that have to come
- 12 together are the business end of the districts, the local
- 13 jurisdiction is very key, as is the Office of Local
- 14 Assistance and the extended family of the Office of Local
- 15 Assistance in your organization which are support,
- 16 technical and otherwise, financial, technical and
- 17 otherwise, to citizens in general, but in this case the
- 18 districts.
- So we're trying to figure out how we
- 20 institutionalize behavior in the local jurisdiction and
- 21 in the Office of Local Assistance and in your
- 22 organization so that you have the right kind of support
- 23 at the right time with the right people that initiate
- 24 these projects and then sustains them over time with the
- 25 support system behind it. We think there's a triangle

- 1 here that we have to think about. It isn't just the
- 2 schools. It's the other two components of the triangle.
- 3 So we're trying to figure this out and these are
- 4 challenges, I must admit.
- 5 The first challenge is just access to the
- 6 schools, how do you get into the schools. We've heard
- 7 your curriculum staff here tell us that one of their big
- 8 problems is that they don't know how to get the attention
- 9 of the administrators in the schools. The teachers can
- 10 only go so far in implementing programs. What they need
- 11 is policies and directions from the bosses that say yeah,
- 12 you will do it this way kind of a thing. So that's a big
- 13 challenge for them.
- 14 Then one of the biggest chores we have is
- 15 compiling information. To your credit, significant
- 16 credit, you have a lot of information in your files and
- 17 links to information on the internet and other department
- 18 files like the Department of Conservation, Department of
- 19 Education and others. There is a wealth of information
- 20 on how to do this. I doubt very much that we'll
- 21 inventory anything new in this project except maybe that
- 22 slice that is how to institutionalize this, how to make
- 23 it happen over time. That's where our focus is.
- 24 But so far we have appointed what we call a
- 25 resource committee which is a number of individuals from

- 1 other units from throughout the Board. I think the
- 2 number now is 10 or 12 now. We keep adding to it as we
- 3 discover linkages to our program. These are our resource
- 4 people. These are first experts in their field, whether
- 5 it be composting, organics management, recycling or
- 6 whatever, used oil, whatever. These are our resource
- 7 people, technical people that give us advice on where to
- 8 go to understand fully how these things might fit with
- 9 school districts.
- Secondly, they later on will become your
- 11 resource to actually go out and provide support to
- 12 implement programs, hands-on out there with the local
- 13 jurisdiction and the school districts and others as the
- 14 project is rolled out to do it. So in effect this is
- 15 transferring technology to the broader organization for
- 16 use later on.
- We've developed a resource guide. This is a
- 18 document that's a work in progress right now. We have
- 19 dubbed it "Tools For Schools" now, but basically this is
- 20 a how-to cookbook which we're trying to develop which
- 21 will be one of the final products of the project when we
- 22 develop it. But in the interim it will also be our
- 23 document to use as we make the analysis of each of these
- 24 segments in the school districts.
- We're compiling information in chapters here

- 1 under various headings that we'll use as an analytical
- 2 tool so that presumably this will be a pretty darn
- 3 complete document that will be then available for you to
- 4 distribute throughout the state, and we believe it will
- 5 be generic enough that it can be used not only in
- 6 schools, but it can be used in other institutional
- 7 settings, hospitals, prisons, any institutional kind of a
- 8 setting. This will be what we think is major product of
- 9 our project.
- We also are developing a step-by-step guide for
- 11 ourselves as to what we do when we go into a school, when
- 12 a team goes into a school district, just how do we go
- 13 about the analysis, where do we begin. And that isn't
- 14 quite as far along as this document is, although we do
- 15 have an outline of that that we're working with right now
- 16 in developing.
- Our goal is to really develop a step-by-step
- 18 cookbook for everybody to use. And the real hard
- 19 deliverable product from this contract will be an
- 20 analysis of each of the pilot districts and we hope to do
- 21 six. We have in the proposal that we will do up to six,
- 22 but it looks very much like we might be able to manage
- 23 six with the time and resource that we have. So we're
- 24 going for it.
- 25 We've spent a great deal of time in addition to

- 1 developing this book of actually sorting out what
- 2 districts are we going to try to work with and we've
- 3 developed some criteria that we've used. We've come up
- 4 with a -- well, we call it a semi-long list and then we
- 5 have a semi-short list and then we have a short list that
- 6 we're actually contacting right now, and I can share
- 7 those with you if you like.
- 8 This is a sheet -- this is actually the ranking
- 9 sheet and I'll give you a little bit of background. We
- 10 chose as a team not to make a statewide solicitation of
- 11 school districts for two reasons. One, we were fearful
- 12 nobody would respond; second, we were afraid that
- 13 everybody would respond. Either way we were concerned.
- 14 So what we did is used your staff, our resource
- 15 committee as well as the Office of Local Assistance
- 16 people who work with local jurisdictions all the time,
- 17 every day, day in and day out. We used them as a
- 18 resource to identify those that met certain criteria that
- 19 we thought was important, and among those criteria was --
- 20 and we ranked these criteria in an exercise over a couple
- 21 of meetings.
- 22 The criteria were willingness to participate,
- 23 and we had a list of things of what that means under that
- 24 criteria. We wanted districts that took into account
- 25 geographical considerations. We wanted to take into

- 1 account political considerations. What I mean by that is
- 2 small pea, not large pea, political consideration is we
- 3 didn't want to go school district in which there was a
- 4 dispute going on between the school district and a local
- 5 jurisdiction over something, whether it be waste matters
- 6 or not. We didn't want to invite ourselves into some
- 7 kind of a sticky situation. Thankfully we found none
- 8 like that in the ones that we considered.
- 9 We wanted to look at jurisdictions that are
- 10 not -- that are school districts that are in
- 11 jurisdictions that are not meeting AB 939 goals as much
- 12 as we can so that if we do get some benefit from our
- 13 work, it will help that local jurisdiction meet the AB
- 14 939 goals. And then we have several other routine kinds
- 15 of criteria that I can share with you if you like. I can
- 16 hand this out.
- 17 We want rural, suburban, urban. We want
- 18 districts that cross jurisdictional boundaries. For
- 19 example, one on the list has three different counties and
- 20 four cities in their jurisdiction that that school
- 21 district covers. We wanted large, medium and small. We
- 22 were looking for some that had some experience and we
- 23 were looking for some that didn't have very much
- 24 experience.
- 25 And finally, thanks to your advisors in a

- 1 meeting we had with them, we added to that demographics,
- 2 that we wanted to look at a diverse population, both
- 3 ethnically and economically. I've got a chart that I can
- 4 hand out to you that shows what those districts are.
- 5 The one I just handed out, you can see that we
- 6 have them ranked on the right-hand column, and as you can
- 7 see Visalia came out number one; Ravenswood, which is in
- 8 East Palo Alto, is number two. If you have any questions
- 9 about those, I will be glad to try to address them.
- There are some on here, for example, Amador fell
- 11 off the list. It's number 13. It's the very last one.
- 12 And they're not really technically off the list, but it's
- 13 not one we're going to pay a lot of attention to unless
- 14 we have a whole bunch of them fall out.
- We have chosen to take the top eight of this
- 16 list to follow-up on, and Madam Chairwoman has sent a
- 17 letter to the district superintendents of the top eight
- 18 on this list, indicating to them that we have selected
- 19 them as a potential pilot and we would like to get
- 20 together with them and discuss it and find out if we
- 21 could work together. And we're in the process now of
- 22 following up on that letter this week and next. So
- 23 that's the districts.
- 24 This next chart is the one that shows you what
- 25 the diversity is of these districts. And I won't belabor

- 1 this. If you have questions, it's pretty self-evident.
- 2 What we kind of found out is that diversity is not much
- 3 of an issue in this state in the main. There are some
- 4 pockets of nondiversity, I suppose, ethnic diversity, but
- 5 not many anymore. We have a pretty diverse population in
- 6 California. So that didn't turn out to be much of an
- 7 issue that we had to deal with. Pretty much the ones
- 8 that your staff recommended we could work with turned out
- 9 to be pretty darn diverse.
- 10 Again, on this chart -- I'll leave it to your
- 11 leisure to look it over, but you can see it's fairly
- 12 diverse. There are some that are best -- Huntington
- 13 Beach is on this list. It is not under consideration.
- 14 We have -- Long Beach is the largest district. It's got
- 15 87 schools and 89,000 student population. We didn't
- 16 think we could take on too many more big ones that size.
- 17 If Long Beach falls off the list, we can go to Santa Ana,
- 18 Huntington Beach, and I just -- I got a call this week
- 19 inviting us to consider San Juan Unified School District
- 20 in Sacramento as well, which is very large district.
- 21 So unless you have any questions, I won't go any
- 22 further over that. With the schedule --
- 23 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Excuse me.
- Mr. Jones.
- 25 MR. WHITNEY: Excuse me.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones has a
- 2 question.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have a question on the --
- 4 not on the demographics but on the actual rankings. Is
- 5 part of -- in ranking these did you look at where the
- 6 majority of their waste comes from now as far as what
- 7 their needs were? Schools that cook their own lunches
- 8 for kids and in some schools they have to do it twice a
- 9 day as opposed to those that get it brought in,
- 10 prepackaged from a regional-type site, is that --
- 11 MR. WHITNEY: We didn't get to that level of
- 12 detail. However, almost fortuitously we did look at meal
- 13 serving because if you'll notice on the demographic chart
- 14 the last two columns is free and reduced meals. That
- 15 tells you how many meals they're serving, and you'll
- 16 notice that there's at least one on here that's at least
- 17 a hundred percent. National City School District serves
- 18 100 percent meals and then the AFDC shows you then what
- 19 the economic situation looks like in that district. So
- 20 in a fortuitous way we did look at the meal serving but
- 21 not at the level of detail that you're asking about.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. Go ahead. Thanks.
- MR. WHITNEY: The schedule from here on is for
- 24 the remainder of this month, and in November we will be
- 25 doing our negotiations, if you will, with school

- 1 districts. We have our meeting with Long Beach Unified
- 2 School District on Friday of this week, as a matter of
- 3 fact, and if they nod their head we will begin work there
- 4 next week.
- 5 We will continue on then with that list of
- 6 eight, and as some drop off we'll add more of the 13
- 7 there as we go along. And I must admit to a little
- 8 nervousness that some of them might not sign up, but we
- 9 hear a lot of enthusiasm. So we'll see when we actually
- 10 put it on the table.
- We're not asking a whole lot of these districts
- 12 in terms of resources. We're not asking them to give us
- 13 a cadre of ten people, we're not asking them for cash,
- 14 we're also not giving them any cash, but we're really
- 15 asking for their records, their information and access to
- 16 the people that understand their waste practices. We'll
- 17 do the rest is basically what it amounts to.
- 18 So this month and next we hope to have all of
- 19 our schools signed up and be working in earnest. We will
- 20 then do the analysis from November to April. We will
- 21 then develop a reporting and tracking system, that's part
- 22 of the contract, to work with your Information Management
- 23 Branch people to develop some kind of a baseline and then
- 24 a tracking system hopefully that we can get on your
- 25 computers so that you have a reporting mechanism to find

- 1 out as schools implement these programs what kind of a
- 2 positive impact that you're having.
- 3 The project update, we'll give you another one
- 4 about February. We think that timing will be good
- 5 because we will be deep into the districts by then and
- 6 we'll be able to give you an update. And during the
- 7 February-April period we will start making our reports
- 8 and recommendations to each of the pilot districts, and
- 9 then ultimately the May-June period of next year we'll
- 10 give you your final report.
- 11 That's pretty much the schedule to date.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 13 Mr. Whitney. Any questions or comments?
- Mr. Jones.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just another question. The
- 16 target goal for this program is to attack the wastestream
- 17 that's being generated within the schools.
- 18 MR. WHITNEY: Yes.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And give them the tools.
- 20 MR. WHITNEY: Yes. In listening to your WRAP
- 21 awards this morning, that would be ideal if we could get
- 22 the same kind of results that you're getting in
- 23 businesses that we could get in school districts because
- 24 that's essentially what they are. They're a business, at
- 25 least the slice that we're looking at. So we're trying

- 1 to motivate them to do this and sustain it for their
- 2 reasons, not our reasons, not because the law says they
- 3 have to, because it doesn't, but we want them to be
- 4 motivated because it's in their self-interest to do it.
- 5 We're trying to discover what that is, what is
- 6 their self-interest. I happen to believe that there's
- 7 some real good economics at the bottom line here. I
- 8 could be proven wrong because we haven't been testing
- 9 this yet, but that's what the pilot is all about. On the
- 10 other hand we've been told by your curriculum people and
- 11 from our -- we have a couple of superintendents of
- 12 schools working on our consulting team, one retired and
- 13 one still active, and they tell us look, you're up
- 14 against it because they have all of these classroom
- 15 mandates now, this Stanford 9, all this testing business.
- 16 All these mandates that are coming down has got
- 17 these folks right up to their eyeballs with pressure, and
- 18 to get their attention on something that they have no
- 19 legal responsibility for, when you get right down to it,
- 20 is going to be a challenge. My theory is if we can
- 21 motivate them with some ideas about how to take some of
- 22 the money from their bottom line that they're spending on
- 23 waste now and they could shift it over to put it on their
- 24 higher priority, which is students in the classroom, that
- 25 might be something that would motivate them and then

- 1 would sustain that program over time.
- So that's what the pilot is really all about and
- 3 frankly remains to be seen whether we can pull it off.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- I'm glad. That's
- 5 what I voted on. I just wanted to make sure it hadn't
- 6 changed. But I think that it's important -- and I don't
- 7 know all these jurisdictions, but I've worked inside an
- 8 awful lot of school districts, providing solid waste and
- 9 recycling services and never found two to be the same. I
- 10 found them to be similar but none the same. I think what
- 11 keys it -- there's a couple things.
- You're right as your point of light, but I think
- 13 the other thing, what I was hoping is going to come out
- 14 of this, and I'm still hoping, is that based on certain
- 15 criteria like do they cook, what kind of meals do they
- 16 cook, is there a lot of tin, is there a lot of canned
- 17 food, those types of things, to show them ways.
- 18 The only way that I could ever do this was to
- 19 actually go in the kitchens, go in the classrooms, show
- 20 them where they could save money and it was the principal
- 21 understanding that he could save on his garbage bill, not
- 22 by buying a compactor because I'm going to charge him
- 23 weight on the compactor, but on real programs. And I got
- 24 nervous in the last board meeting because there were
- 25 dollars going to be allocated to mulching lawnmowers and

- 1 tree trimmers for schools as part of this program and
- 2 that doesn't go to the heart of it for me.
- 3 You have to know what goes to the heart of it is
- 4 trying to give them a cookbook to show them how to save
- 5 money without listening to somebody giving them a line
- 6 about how a compactor will do it.
- 7 MR. WHITNEY: Right. If I may belabor for just
- 8 a moment to speak to the point you're trying to make is
- 9 that what this comes down to fundamentally is analyzing
- 10 their procurement practices on the one side, i.e.,
- 11 pre-waste, and their waste system on the other side,
- 12 post-waste. A big component of that post-waste is their
- 13 cafeteria setting. In fact, this project originally
- 14 started out focusing on that and we discovered we could
- 15 go beyond that possibly.
- On our consultant team we have general manager
- 17 of the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Powers Authority the
- 18 food service that serves five districts food services.
- 19 So we've got him on retainer to help us sort that whole
- 20 element out. We think that's a big pay-off element
- 21 there.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Get the guy that cooks for
- 23 140 kids out of a can too because his needs are going to
- 24 be very different and his budget is going to be very
- 25 different.

- 1 MR. WHITNEY: Absolutely.
- 2 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 3 Mr. Whitney.
- 4 MR. WHITNEY: Thank you.
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have three more
- 6 large items and we have to be out of this room at 4:00.
- 7 There are no exceptions because they have a City Council
- 8 meeting in here.
- 9 Administration and Policy, Number 30. This is
- 10 the consideration of the report to the Legislature on the
- 11 duplication or overlap between the Waste Board and DOC.
- 12 MS. PACKARD: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and
- 13 Board Members. My name is Rubia Packard. I'm the
- 14 Assistant Director for the Policy and Analysis Office and
- 15 today we are presenting to you Agenda Item 30 which is
- 16 consideration of the report to the Legislature on the
- 17 duplication or overlap between California Integrated
- 18 Waste Management Board and Department of Conservation
- 19 programs.
- 20 This report was mandated by Senate Bill 332 of
- 21 1999 which requires the Board in a consultation with the
- 22 Department of Conservation to prepare and submit a report
- 23 to the Legislature by December 1st of 2000. The purpose
- 24 of the report is to identify any duplication or overlap
- 25 in three distinct areas -- public information and

- 1 education programs, local government review and
- 2 assistance programs, and recycled materials market
- 3 development programs.
- 4 The law further requires the report to include
- 5 suggested legislation, budget actions or administrative
- 6 actions that could be taken to eliminate any duplication
- 7 or overlap between our programs.
- 8 In preparing this report, the approach we took
- 9 was to investigate how DOC's and the Board's programs
- 10 relate to each other. In those areas where there is a
- 11 relationship between the two programs, we sought to
- 12 discover how program effectiveness could be enhanced and
- 13 resources maximized to achieve our overall program
- 14 mandates.
- 15 As identified in the agenda item, options for
- 16 the Board include approving the report as prepared by
- 17 staff for submission to the Legislature, approving the
- 18 report with changes for submission to the Legislature,
- 19 and disapproving the report as prepared by staff. We
- 20 have not included a staff recommendation in the item
- 21 because it was our belief that the Board Members might
- 22 like to give us some additional direction or input on the
- 23 report, so we wanted to leave that as open as possible
- 24 since it is a draft report.
- 25 Tracy Harper from my staff and the Policy and

- 1 Analysis Office will further describe the process we went
- 2 through, briefly, to prepare this report and at the
- 3 conclusion of her presentation we would very much
- 4 appreciate any comments that you have or any other
- 5 direction that you would like to give us regarding the
- 6 draft report and the findings in the recommendations.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 8 Ms. Packard.
- 9 MS. HARPER: Good afternoon. Again, my name is
- 10 Tracy Harper and I'm with the Policy and Analysis Office.
- To give some background, as you may be aware the
- 12 issue of duplication or overlap between the Board's and
- 13 DOC's program is not a new one. In fact, in the 1990s on
- 14 six different occasions various analyses led to the
- 15 recommendation that the recycling functions carried out
- 16 by the Department of Conservation be combined with the
- 17 recycling functions of the Board.
- 18 In 1992, the Legislature indicated in the
- 19 supplemental report of the Budget Act their intent to
- 20 transfer the Division of Recycling to the Board. In 1994
- 21 and 1995, the Governor's budget proposed a transfer of
- 22 DOC's recycling functions to the Board and the
- 23 Legislative Analyst's Office recommended in their
- 24 1993-1994 budget analysis transferring the beverage
- 25 container recycling program to the Board.

- 1 The Little Hoover Commission report in 1994
- 2 recommended that a new comprehensive recycling program be
- 3 established within Cal/EPA. In fact, it is stated that a
- 4 key policy question for the State is whether an orphan
- 5 recycling program can be as effective as one that is an
- 6 integral part of the State's overall solid waste
- 7 management program. In its 1996 California Competitive
- 8 Report, the Wilson administration proposed a new
- 9 Department of Waste Control within Cal/EPA. Finally, in
- 10 last year's budget the Governor expressed the intention
- 11 to explore consolidating the Division of Recycling with
- 12 the recycling functions of the Board, which brings us to
- 13 today's report.
- 14 When we first met with the DOC staff last
- 15 summer, it was our belief that we would look at a series
- 16 of memorandum of agreements, MOAs, between the Board and
- 17 DOC that had been completed in 1995 and 1996, discovery
- 18 that duplication and overlap had been eliminated, and
- 19 that while we were both working on recycling, we could
- 20 simply by improving coordination and/or a collaboration,
- 21 eliminate confusion over who was doing what relative to
- 22 recycling programs within the state.
- 23 We met with DOC and agreed upon an approach that
- 24 included looking into the three major program areas --
- 25 public information education, local government review and

- 1 assistance, and recycled materials market development.
- 2 This agreed-upon approach included identifying areas of
- 3 duplication and overlap along with proposals for
- 4 eliminating it, but also looking forward to including
- 5 opportunities for future coordination and collaboration.
- 6 The whole approach was based upon determining
- 7 how resources could be maximized resulting in increased
- 8 program effectiveness. In order to gather this
- 9 information, we developed a matrix that included each
- 10 activity engaged in by the Board related to the three
- 11 program areas. We then identified where each of the
- 12 Board program area activities touched an activity carried
- 13 out by DOC. We then analyzed that specific program area
- 14 to determine if those activities could be considered
- 15 duplication, overlap or an area where further
- 16 collaboration and coordination would again result in
- 17 increased program effectiveness.
- 18 The matrix was provided to DOC staff so they
- 19 could do the same type of analysis and provide the same
- 20 level of information. Ultimately we did receive some
- 21 program information in a different format. Each of the
- 22 three program areas we found duplication and overlap.
- Now for the findings. The report includes
- 24 findings for each of the three program areas. The first
- 25 finding is that overlap and duplication in public

- 1 education campaigns has resulted in the public receiving
- 2 a mixed message.
- 3 A second finding, overlap and duplication in
- 4 local government review and assistance has resulted in
- 5 decreased program efficiencies. And the third finding,
- 6 overlap and duplication in market development has
- 7 resulted in lost opportunities for sharing expertise that
- 8 would maximize program effectiveness.
- 9 Based on those findings, it is clear that
- 10 duplication and overlap does exist. This report finds
- 11 that while the orphan recycling program at the Division
- 12 of Recycling may function, the State's resources would be
- 13 maximized and program effectiveness enhanced if the
- 14 recycling functions under the Division of Recycling were
- 15 combined with the recycling functions of the Board.
- 16 This report recommends that consolidation of the
- 17 recycling functions of the Division of Recycling and the
- 18 recycling functions of the Board is the most appropriate
- 19 remedy. And that concludes our presentation.
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Ms. Harper.
- 21 Mr. Paparian.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: This is going to be a
- 23 pretty important thing that we discuss and vote on and I
- 24 believe there may be a number of people in Sacramento who
- 25 may have some comments on this. I know that the

- 1 requirement to get the report to the Legislature is
- 2 December 1st. I think the time would be certainly tight
- 3 for us after the next board meeting, but I would like to
- 4 give the opportunity to people in Sacramento who might
- 5 want to provide comment on this to provide those comments
- 6 and take our actual vote on it at the November meeting.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Any other
- 8 comments before we move into that?
- 9 I agree with Mr. Paparian. I've gotten a number
- 10 of calls from stakeholders that asked if we could discuss
- 11 this in Sacramento and I really appreciate the time
- 12 crunch and all that, but I think this would be something
- 13 that we should do. And I don't know -- do we need a vote
- 14 to continue?
- 15 Hearing no objection to continue it to the
- 16 November meeting, I would like to go ahead and do that.
- 17 Okay. Thank you very much.
- 18 MS. PACKARD: Thank you.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Item 31.
- 20 MS. JORDAN: Good afternoon, Chair
- 21 Moulton-Patterson and Members of the Board. I'm Terry
- 22 Jordan with the Administration and Finance Division, and
- 23 I'm going to introduce Susan Villa to present Agenda Item
- 24 Number 31.
- 25 MS. VILLA: Madam Chair, Board Members, I'm

- 1 Susan Villa, Manager of the Business Administration
- 2 Office, and I'm here to present Agenda Item 31,
- 3 consideration of approval of consulting and professional
- 4 services concepts for fiscal year 2000-2001 from the
- 5 Integrated Waste Management Account.
- 6 Before I go into the item itself, we have a
- 7 couple of corrections in the item. On page 31-2, the
- 8 amount held in reserve should say \$270,184, and on page
- 9 31-3 under the funding the amount should be \$59,000 and
- 10 again on the resolution the amount under the "therefore,"
- 11 "now, therefore," should be \$59,000.
- 12 At the September board meeting there were a
- 13 couple of concepts that the Board asked for us to bring
- 14 back at a later time, and at this time we are only
- 15 bringing one of those concepts forward today to be
- 16 considered and that is the Environmental Protection
- 17 Indicators for California, or EPIC project, for your
- 18 consideration today.
- 19 This particular project is a broad-reaching
- 20 project and the results will be mutually beneficial to
- 21 all of the boards and departments and offices within
- 22 Cal/EPA. Cal/EPA has asked the Office of Environmental
- 23 Health Hazard Assessment to take the lead on this project
- 24 and the approximate amount of the overall project is
- 25 about \$600,000. Our portion of it is \$59,000. All of

- 1 the other boards and departments will have an appropriate
- 2 share based on their PY count. The funding will provide
- 3 for a consultant to assist in the design and
- 4 implementation of the environmental indicators study.
- 5 Staff recommends that the project be funded at
- 6 \$59,000 and that Resolution 2000-453 be approved. This
- 7 project meets the goals and divisions of Cal/EPA and
- 8 aligns with the Governor's environmental policies and it
- 9 also meets the Board's strategic goals.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Ms. Villa.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Madam Chair, I would like
- 12 to move the adoption of Resolution 2000-453,
- 13 consideration of approval of consulting and professional
- 14 service concepts for the fiscal year 2000-2001 from the
- 15 Integrated Waste Management Account in the amount of
- 16 \$59,000.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Second.
- 18 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. It's been moved
- 19 by Mr. Medina, seconded by Mr. Paparian, and Mr. Eaton
- 20 has a question or comment.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER EATON: What was our percentage
- 22 last year that we gave to Cal/EPA as part of our
- 23 assessment per the budget? Each agency is required under
- 24 the creation of Cal/EPA to contribute a certain amount of
- 25 money to Cal/EPA based upon PYs. What was that last year

- 1 or this year currently?
- 2 MS. JORDAN: That is a direct appropriation.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Right. (Inaudible). It's
- 4 given to them instead.
- 5 MS. JORDAN: That's right. I don't have that
- 6 percentage off the top of my head, but the actual dollar
- 7 amount is approximately \$300,000 out of IWMA and I
- 8 believe that the oil has a small portion, \$20,000 or
- 9 \$30,000 if I'm not mistaken. I don't have the Budget Act
- 10 in front of me but the IWMA has \$300,000 that is directly
- 11 appropriated to Cal/EPA.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER EATON: So this would be another
- 13 20, 25 percent. How much of this was appropriated in
- 14 this year's fiscal budget for the EPIC program? Has that
- 15 been approved yet by the Legislature?
- MS. JORDAN: No. There has not been monies
- 17 appropriated for this purpose. It is within their
- 18 strategic vision, as is within our strategic vision, to
- 19 use consulting and professional services and they have
- 20 asked because of the vision that they have and the
- 21 alignment with the Governor's policy that the boards and
- 22 departments align with their vision, strategic vision,
- 23 and that we contribute towards this effort because it
- 24 benefits all of the boards and departments to meet the
- 25 environmental requirements.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER EATON: What happens if the
- 2 Legislature doesn't approve the EPIC program? What
- 3 happens to the money that was given?
- 4 MS. JORDAN: I'm not certain I understand the --
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: This is a program that
- 6 needs legislative authority.
- 7 MS. FISH: No.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER EATON: My understanding from
- 9 talking to the budget consultants in the Legislature
- 10 this is a separate program. Environmental indicators
- 11 needs approval for each of the agencies because we're all
- 12 contributing. A certain amount of money that was given
- 13 to each of the agencies is allocated through the annual.
- 14 We have -- this is a separate allocation.
- 15 MS. JORDAN: If I may --
- 16 BOARD MEMBER EATON: We've been criticized in
- 17 the past before. That's why I raised objection the last
- 18 time.
- 19 MS. JORDAN: This is a study --
- 20 BOARD MEMBER EATON: And I didn't get the legal
- 21 opinion on it, and yet back 30 days thereafter. So what
- 22 I'm asking is if the money is not approved and not used
- 23 for EPIC, does it come back to the Board?
- 24 MS. FISH: This project I believe will go
- 25 forward because the intent is that the environmental

- 1 indicators will become the performance outcomes of our
- 2 strategic planning that is currently ongoing, and we have
- 3 technical staff that are serving on the team at OEHHA to
- 4 help develop those performance outcomes.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER EATON: -- not been permitted to be
- 6 expended or there's authority for the program in the
- 7 Governor's budget.
- 8 MS. FISH: Strategic planning, however, is an
- 9 expectation of our mandate.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER EATON: Different issue. Different
- 11 issue.
- 12 MS. FISH: Not if the environmental indicators
- 13 or performance outcomes of this result in part of our
- 14 strategic planning process.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER EATON: But to make an assessment
- 16 for each of the different boards and commissions does
- 17 require separate legislative authority. Yes or no. The
- 18 answer is yes. You know it's yes.
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: We have a motion by
- 20 Mr. Medina, seconded by Mr. Paparian, to approve
- 21 Resolution 2000-453.
- 22 Please call the roll.
- 23 BOARD SECRETARY: Eaton.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER EATON: No.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Jones.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Medina.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Paparian.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Aye.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Abstain.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 10 Item 32.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Good afternoon again.
- 12 Item Number 32 is a discussion and
- 13 consideration, evaluation and possible action to direct
- 14 rulemaking on state minimum standards and/or other
- 15 regulations to alter, change or suspend Board policies
- 16 and/or procedures. Long title.
- 17 At the September board meeting, staff was
- 18 directed to come back to this October board meeting with
- 19 a list of policies, regulations, related statutes, so
- 20 that the Board could evaluate the activities of staff
- 21 that have been taking place. In response to the Board's
- 22 request, staff has compiled a matrix from the Diversion,
- 23 Planning and Local Assistance, Permits, and the
- 24 Enforcement Division that contain a listing of policies,
- 25 related regulations, related statutes, and finally a

- 1 description. You'll again see that on the attached
- 2 matrix.
- 3 Staff have also presented to you four options
- 4 that are available. One is to modify the existing
- 5 matrix. The second option is to select specific
- 6 activities or topics from the matrix and direct staff to
- 7 come back, return with a focus discussion item on the
- 8 selections. The third option is to select specific
- 9 topics from the matrix and direct staff to return with an
- 10 action item to alter or suspend some of the selections.
- 11 And finally, the fourth option that staff presented is no
- 12 action at all.
- 13 That concludes my presentation, and we're all
- 14 here for any questions.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So this list -- I don't
- 16 see where the staff recommendation is.
- 17 MR. SCHIAVO: It's back on the first page.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Agenda Item 32, first
- 19 page.
- 20 MR. SCHIAVO: There is no recommendation. It's
- 21 a series of four options.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You essentially gave us a
- 23 list of what the staff policies are. Now, I take it some
- 24 of these policies are in regulation form or have been
- 25 voted on as regulation. Could counsel sort of tell me

- 1 what the difference between a policy and regulation is?
- 2 Since regulations have to be approved after proper
- 3 hearing notice and all that sort of thing, what is the
- 4 difference in terms of weight as far as policy and
- 5 regulation?
- 6 MS. TOBIAS: That is precisely the difference.
- 7 Once the Board adopts something under the Administrative
- 8 Procedures Act and puts something into regulation, it has
- 9 the weight of law and so that's what a board would want.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I understand that, but at
- 11 the last meeting when this came up you indicated to us
- 12 that we were bound by policy.
- 13 MS. TOBIAS: Well, I think I said, if I
- 14 understand which one you're referring to, I think I may
- 15 have said --
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Specifically Billy
- 17 Wright.
- 18 MS. TOBIAS: We were bound by precedent as
- 19 opposed to policy. What I meant by that is in addition
- 20 to regulations, there's often a path or a pattern that a
- 21 board follows over time where by making certain decisions
- 22 over time they set out a pattern or what we often call a
- 23 policy by doing something over and over. And so to
- 24 deviate from that then leads to the possibility that a
- 25 challenge can be brought that the Board, if they switch

- 1 from that, wanders into the -- into an unreasonable
- 2 position.
- 3 When a governmental agency is taken to court,
- 4 one of the things the courts will look at is whether
- 5 they've undertaken a reasonable action. So what the
- 6 Board wants, any board wants, is to basically be
- 7 reasonable back into that. What you want is to be
- 8 consistent with the actions that you've taken all along.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So in essence policy
- 10 doesn't necessarily have the force of law but it can't
- 11 operate as precedent in court.
- 12 MS. TOBIAS: What I think is more of a
- 13 determinant of reasonableness or unreasonableness as
- 14 opposed to saying that policy bears some legal --
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I understand. Now, for a
- 16 policy to be enacted, does that take always a formal
- 17 adoption of the policy or is that, as you were
- 18 indicating, through repeated decisions?
- 19 MS. TOBIAS: I think often when we talk about
- 20 policies, we talk about either a pattern over time or it
- 21 may be something that the Board, in approving a project,
- 22 basically starts to say well, this is the way we would
- 23 like to see this done. So I think the word "policy" is a
- 24 pretty loosely used one.
- 25 Essentially if a board has a policy that they

- 1 want to abide by, it's better to get it into a regulation
- 2 because then we're back to the start. It has the weight
- 3 of law behind it.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Well, Madam Chair, at
- 5 some point in the not-too-distant future, as far as I
- 6 think, we ought to review specifically each policy. If
- 7 we can do that, say, on a bit-by-bit basis between, say,
- 8 now and just throwing off the top of my head the January
- 9 meeting, then I suspect we would -- I personally wouldn't
- 10 favor the necessity of a blanket suspension of all
- 11 policies pending review.
- 12 However, if it's going to take longer than that,
- 13 then my own recommendation, feeling, would be on the
- 14 suspension policy that have been undertaken so that we
- 15 can review them until the light of a new way of looking
- 16 at things.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: So you said January?
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I throw that out. I'm
- 19 saying January. I'm just --
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Because I know on
- 21 boards I have been on we have done a review of policies
- 22 and regulations like four a meeting or something like
- 23 that and gone through them.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I think that is
- 25 absolutely appropriate considering there has been a

- 1 change in administration. I'm not one of the
- 2 administration appointees, but I think that's reasonable.
- 3 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Well, I certainly
- 4 agree with you and I would like to go down that road
- 5 rather than suspending them, and I'm speaking for myself
- 6 personally, but I don't want to take two years.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No, no, no. I'd like it
- 8 to take place while -- if it takes place, while I'm still
- 9 here.
- 10 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Other Board Members?
- 11 Mr. Paparian and Mr. Jones.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: A couple of things. At
- 13 the agenda workshop last week, I brought up the question
- 14 of state minimum standards and whether or not they should
- 15 be part of this list, and I'm not sure if we left it that
- 16 they ought to be on the list or not, but I believe that
- 17 they should be on the list of items that we take a look
- 18 at in terms of whether or not we want to engage in a
- 19 process of potential revision.
- 20 MS. NAUMAN: Yes, Mr. Paparian. We did note
- 21 that you had made that request, and it would be our
- 22 intent while we didn't revise the list between then and
- 23 now, but that would be included and we're certainly
- 24 looking for your direction on any other items that we
- 25 might have overlooked.

- 1 This was our first effort to take a cut at
- 2 putting together this list. So we're looking for
- 3 additional things you would like to see included as we
- 4 start to work with you to prioritize what ones to look at
- 5 and in what order.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: The second question I
- 7 had was the issue of landfill gas violations and
- 8 expanding boundaries to address landfill gas violations.
- 9 Is that within the long-term violation policy adopted in
- 10 7-1994?
- MS. TOBIAS: I would say that that is. The
- 12 issue of an entity adding land as opposed to the
- 13 long-term gas violation policy is really something more
- 14 that has been discussed by the Board with a couple of
- 15 permits that have come through.
- 16 One of the things that I wanted to mention is
- 17 that of course a board can change their regulations,
- 18 their pattern of doing business whenever they feel the
- 19 need to. The consideration that any board needs to take
- 20 into account is what we often call the pipeline projects,
- 21 projects that have been coming along with some
- 22 expectation that the Board will continue to act in the
- 23 same way that it's acted in the past.
- 24 So as the Board considers the kinds of changes
- 25 that they want to make, you also have to consider to what

- 1 extent there may be some reliance on the part of
- 2 operators or anybody who is regulated by the Board to
- 3 take into account that reliance or expectation aspect.
- 4 That's something that really comes into that pattern that
- 5 I was talking about, about what a reasonable board would
- 6 follow, but I don't think that's in the policy or the
- 7 regulation.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: That was the only
- 9 related policy I saw here. So it's not really a policy
- 10 of the Board per se.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The gas?
- 12 MS. TOBIAS: Acquisition of land.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's a law. That's
- 14 statute that it's an option.
- MS. NAUMAN: I don't believe so, Mr. Jones. I
- 16 have understood it always to be more of a practice, as
- 17 it's a strategy to address the problem of long-term gas
- 18 violations, and our long-term policy is what addresses
- 19 how to revise a permit in light of the fact there is that
- 20 ongoing violation.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: My turn.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones, yes.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think two things. One,
- 24 wasn't there a discussion at the Board prior to me ever
- 25 getting here about how to issue permits that have

- 1 long-term gas violations and didn't the Board then come
- 2 up with this long-term gas? So it wasn't a case of a lot
- 3 of permits coming forward so we established a precedent.
- 4 It was a policy discussion about what are the benefits to
- 5 leaving a facility unpermitted versus dealing with it as
- 6 a long-term violation and what latitude did the Board
- 7 have.
- 8 MS. TOBIAS: As I recall, it came up because we
- 9 knew that a permit was coming forward where there were
- 10 long-term gas violations, and the staff basically brought
- 11 forward to the Board that very issue of should we keep up
- 12 a permit or a landfill that has long-term gas violations
- 13 which are expensive to fix or which take a number of
- 14 years, is it better to have that facility permitted and
- 15 fixing their gas violations or to sit out there with
- 16 either an outdated permit or no permit given the amount
- 17 of time it takes to address a gas violation. So that's
- 18 when the Board adopted that policy.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: My other point was I like
- 20 the idea of having a workshop on these things. I don't
- 21 know if January is enough time. It's a couple of months.
- 22 I would also ask that Subtitle D, Title 14, Title 27,
- 23 Title 15 be looked at because if you look at Title 14,
- 24 when it talks about 5 percent gas in testing, it triggers
- 25 more testing, it triggers getting an idea of what the

- 1 scope of the problem is, and it is there to protect the
- 2 human health and safety at the perimeter, at the boundary
- 3 line.
- 4 So I would like -- the discussion is good to
- 5 have on what the pros and cons or whatever, but it can
- 6 only be delivered, I think, with an understanding of what
- 7 the regulations are and what they do because nowhere that
- 8 I've ever seen does the fact that there is gas trigger a
- 9 violation. It only triggers that you start a process to
- 10 identify and determine how that moves. Now, that may be
- 11 understated. Maybe it is a violation of state minimum
- 12 standards, but it's the trigger, it's the trigger --
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I don't know. Based on
- 14 what I heard last month, it sounded to me like it
- 15 triggers a violation of state minimum standards, but my
- 16 own position is, to put it on the board, that the 5
- 17 percent violation per se is an indication that the public
- 18 health is at hazard.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: At the boundary.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes. Is at hazard at
- 21 the boundary, and since it's escaping gas, probably
- 22 anything within the periphery, within a reasonable area
- 23 of the boundary. I don't think it can be corrected by an
- 24 expansion of the site because we're talking about
- 25 escaping gas.

- 1 The 5 percent itself is an indication of
- 2 violation and that does not require much, if any, further
- 3 substantiations from us because the legislature or the
- 4 Congress has made the initial findings and came up with 5
- 5 percent. Had they chosen, they could have come up with
- 6 10 percent, 15 percent or 20 percent, but they came up
- 7 with 5 percent.
- 8 I think it is an error for us to say that we
- 9 have to second guess and embellish or gild the lily based
- 10 on what Congress has already found. To put an added
- 11 burden on the regulatory body, that is not in the regs
- 12 and I don't think it's in the statute or the law.
- These are my own preliminary feelings as far as
- 14 how much of a record we have to build, and it's always
- 15 best to build up a maximum record, but as to how much of
- 16 a record we have to build before we say that there's a
- 17 violation here and we are not going to agree to an
- 18 expansion or an extenuation.
- 19 So I just want to put that on the table because
- 20 I guess Billy Wright is coming up next month. We can
- 21 take a little bit more time on the others, but Billy
- 22 Wright we're going to have to make some decision in this
- 23 area because we have no choice.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Are you saying the issues I
- 25 bring up about what the trigger points are is an

- 1 embellishment about what the Congress has just said?
- 2 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes. I tend to think so.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Really?
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I tend to think so based
- 5 on the fact that the way we mitigate is to expand the
- 6 landfill.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The 5 percent -- and Madam
- 8 Chair, I'll stop here in two seconds but I've just been
- 9 accused of --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No, no, no. Please.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- embellishing and --
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Please, no.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'm not going to walk away
- 14 from that.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You asked me the
- 16 question and you used the word.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No, what I said was let's
- 18 have the full discussion.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Steve, please don't take
- 20 personally policy differences.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I don't. That part I like,
- 22 but when it comes to --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Don't use the word
- 24 accuse. I'm not accusing you of anything. The only
- 25 thing I'm accusing you of is that we don't agree.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's fine. It's happened
- 2 before and it will happen again --
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: It's happened again.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- that part I don't mind,
- 5 but in reading the law I want the benefit of -- I don't
- 6 care who you want to pick in this audience to read the
- 7 law and understand the law because Congress approved
- 8 Subtitle D and we approved Title 14, 15 and 27 to comply,
- 9 and I'm -- that's my point --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- is that they are
- 12 different animals.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And I will tell you that
- 14 I am thinking out loud now based on my own preliminary
- 15 investigation of the issue. I no more want to be pressed
- 16 into saying that everything I'm saying came off the
- 17 mountain top and I'm down here with the caverns. I'm
- 18 trying to figure this one out myself, but please don't
- 19 assume that my having a disagreement with you means I'm
- 20 accusing you of anything.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I don't. It's just when
- 22 you say embellishment --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I didn't say -- you said
- 24 embellishment and I thought okay. That's fine. If
- 25 that's the word you want to use, I'll say yes.

- 1 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Jones, had you
- 2 finished?
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I did and then some.
- 4 (Laughter)
- 5 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Medina is next.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Given that we have five
- 7 minutes remaining --
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: And we have one public
- 9 speaker.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: These are all relevant
- 11 issues and it does make sense to review existing policy
- 12 and I look forward to having that opportunity. I think
- 13 the idea of a workshop for the Board is a good one
- 14 because we have some very good discussions during the
- 15 workshops.
- 16 I am, however, adverse to suspending all
- 17 policies at such time and I think current policies should
- 18 remain in place until such time as we have an opportunity
- 19 to review them. I think it's also important that on
- 20 those policies which we all agree on that we can live
- 21 with, we should move on to the ones that have greater
- 22 urgency to be reviewed, some of the ones that have been
- 23 mentioned. So I look forward to doing that.
- 24 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Medina.
- 25 Mr. Paparian, and I would like to speak for a

- 1 second.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: One of the things that I
- 3 was talking about a few minutes ago was related to one of
- 4 the state minimum standards and I just wanted to state my
- 5 understanding that the State -- that this Board does have
- 6 some discretion through the regulatory process to
- 7 investigate those state minimum standards and make
- 8 alterations if it believes those alterations are
- 9 justified.
- The state minimum standards were adopted, I
- 11 believe, about ten years ago, and they may still be just
- 12 as good as they were ten years ago or we may have better
- 13 information at this point as to what should be a state
- 14 minimum standard and at what level we should set that
- 15 minimum standard. That's what I think we ought to take a
- 16 look at over the coming months.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Eaton.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER EATON: I just wanted to find out
- 19 what time the tour started tomorrow?
- 20 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. 9:00, I think.
- 21 Just so we have some closure here, I'm hearing the
- 22 majority of the Board say they want to look at these
- 23 policies, regulations and the federal regulations at -- I
- 24 think it's going to take more than one workshop, but in a
- 25 timely manner, say through January. Is that the

- 1 agreement of the Board? Did you want to prioritize them
- 2 or have staff prioritize them?
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: It's more neutral if
- 4 staff does it.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think Mr. Medina is
- 6 right. There's an awful lot of them we'll probably have
- 7 a disagreement with. Why waste our time?
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: The first meeting come up
- 9 with the ones the staff don't think we have any
- 10 disagreement with or we're neutral on, and if they're
- 11 wrong, we'll say so.
- 12 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Does staff have enough
- 13 direction? And I'm sorry I'm rushing, it's just the time
- 14 constraints with this room.
- 15 MS. FISH: How about if we come up with a list
- 16 of priorities and then work with your staff to make sure
- 17 that we have the correct priority order and then schedule
- 18 maybe a two- or three-day workshop for January to begin
- 19 going through them.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I would say -- next month
- 21 is November. I think we can get the agreement reached
- 22 upon out of the way in November, come up with the list of
- 23 ones that we don't agree on, and then I would say start
- 24 working on the easier ones in December and January.
- MS. FISH: Okay. So ones the Board would be

- 1 fine with to come forward in November, and then ones that
- 2 we believe will take further work and possibly a workshop
- 3 in December.
- 4 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Right, and then with
- 5 the thought we could go through January.
- 6 MS. FISH: And the workshop would be in January.
- 7 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Can you handle that?
- 8 (Laughter)
- 9 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I don't mean you
- 10 personally, but the November part, the --
- MS. FISH: We do have a fairly large agenda for
- 12 November which is -- you know, I hate to bring up the
- 13 move thing again, but we are moving beginning November
- 14 2nd. So November is a little difficult. And then
- 15 December we have a fairly full agenda, but we'll do the
- 16 best we can.
- 17 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. Well, we
- 18 appreciate that.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: During the holidays.
- MS. FISH: That, too.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: And we do have one --
- 22 that brings us to the end of our agenda except for public
- 23 comment. We have Kevin Metcalf from the Humboldt County
- 24 Division of Environmental Health.
- 25 MR. METCALF: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair and

- 1 Members of the Board.
- 2 I am in receipt of a letter from Michael
- 3 Schmaeling, the LEA for Santa Barbara County, on Item 32.
- 4 He wasn't here to present it today, so he asked that I
- 5 read into the record, but I can see that many of the
- 6 Board Members are headed in the right direction on the
- 7 points that Michael was making, so maybe I'll just
- 8 summarize one of his points here.
- 9 Michael says that since the Board policy affects
- 10 so many different groups, he would like to request that
- 11 each policy be listed as a separate agenda item and that
- 12 ample notification be given to all concerned groups. I
- 13 think that's where you're headed.
- 14 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you for your
- 15 patience. We appreciate it.
- 16 MR. METCALF: I also had something else to say
- 17 to the Board too in public hearing. Should I stay up
- 18 here?
- 19 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Well, it's public
- 20 hearing now.
- 21 MR. METCALF: Great.
- 22 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: You're on.
- 23 MR. METCALF: I worked for the Humboldt Division
- 24 of Environmental Health and I've been with the Division
- 25 for 15 years. The past five years I've served as the LEA

- 1 and for the County of Humboldt and seven of the
- 2 incorporated cities.
- 3 During these five years of managing the permits,
- 4 permitting and inspection program, I've seen there's a
- 5 lot to do about solid waste and I've witnessed the
- 6 classic struggle between centralized authority and local
- 7 control. I've also taken several opportunities to
- 8 participate on committees and work groups and participate
- 9 in training workshops and to comment on proposed policy
- 10 and regulations. The Board has inspired many thoughts,
- 11 some of which do not require response, some which require
- 12 response and some which are saved for later. Just like
- 13 today, inspired more thoughts.
- The one thing that stands out worth noting and I
- 15 would like to acknowledge today is that the Board's
- 16 programs for illegal disposal and waste tire site
- 17 remediation, these programs have gone a long way towards
- 18 resolving health and safety and environmental problems in
- 19 our area. Over the last five years within Humboldt
- 20 County funds provided by the Board have enabled the
- 21 cleanup of the Wichapeck illegal disposal site, the South
- 22 Spit (phonetic) illegal disposal sites, the Capel Road
- 23 illegal disposal site and currently the Humboldt
- 24 Transport illegal waste tire site which is currently
- 25 under remediation.

- These total over a million dollars, and I would
- 2 just like to say on behalf of the residents of Humboldt
- 3 County we thank the Board for causing these cleanups to
- 4 happen. I hold these programs up for something that
- 5 works, gets things done and I believe is not equaled by
- 6 any other board, and I suggest or recommend that you keep
- 7 these programs together as long as they're in need.
- 8 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very much.
- 9 Thank you. For Mr. Eaton's question and all of ours,
- 10 Ms. Covington-Webb was ill and couldn't be here so we
- 11 kind of need to know about our site visits, what time and
- 12 where to be. Does anybody have any information on that?
- MS. TOBIAS: Well, I'm just reading off of this.
- 14 MS. CITRINO: I have a printed page which has
- 15 the locations and times for the different sites with
- 16 directions. And in the interest of helping everybody to
- 17 make sure they get to the same place at the same time, I
- 18 have a two-sided map which has Eureka and its locations
- 19 on one side and Arcata and its locations on the other
- 20 side.
- 21 CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you so much. We
- 22 appreciate your help on this meeting.
- 23 Thank you to the members of the audience and
- 24 we'll adjourn the October meeting.
- 25 * * *

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	
3	
4	I, Terri L. Emery, CSR 11598, a Certified
5	Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California,
6	do hereby certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
8	down by me in shorthand at the time and place named
9	therein and was thereafter transcribed under my
10	supervision; that this transcript contains a full, true
11	and correct record of the proceedings which took place
12	at the time and place set forth in the caption hereto.
13	
14	
15	I further certify that I have no interest
16	in the event of the action.
17	
18	
19	EXECUTED this 30th day of November, 2000.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Terri L. Emery
25	

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.	